arXiv:1203.3228v1 [math.AP] 14 Mar 2012

On the existence and stability of solitary-wave solutions to a class of evolution equations of Whitham type

Mats Ehrnström

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, 7491 Trondheim, Norway
Institut für Angewandte Mathematik, Leibniz Universität Hannover, Welfengarten 1, 30167 Hannover, Germany

E-mail: `mats.ehrnstrom@math.ntnu.no`

Mark D. Groves

Fachrichtung 6.1 - Mathematik, Universität des Saarlandes, Postfach 151150, 66041 Saarbrücken, Germany
Department of Mathematical Sciences, Loughborough University, Loughborough, LE11 3TU, UK

E-mail: `groves@math.uni-sb.de`

Erik Wahlén

Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Lund University, PO Box 118, 221 00 Lund, Sweden

E-mail: `erik.wahlen@math.lu.se`

Abstract. We consider a class of pseudodifferential evolution equations of the form

$$u_t + (n(u) + Lu)_x = 0,$$

in which L is a linear smoothing operator and n is at least quadratic near the origin; this class includes in particular the Whitham equation. A family of solitary-wave solutions is found using a constrained minimisation principle and concentration-compactness methods for noncoercive functionals. The solitary waves are approximated by (scalings of) the corresponding solutions to partial differential equations arising as weakly nonlinear approximations; in the case of the Whitham equation the approximation is the Korteweg-deVries equation. We also demonstrate that the family of solitary-wave solutions is conditionally energetically stable.

AMS classification scheme numbers: 35Q53, 35A15, 76B15

1. Introduction

In this paper we discuss solitary-wave solutions of the pseudodifferential equation

$$u_t + (Lu + n(u))_x = 0 \tag{1}$$

describing the evolution of a real-valued function u of time $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and space $x \in \mathbb{R}$; here L is a linear smoothing operator and n is at least quadratic near the origin. A concrete example is the equation

$$u_t + 2uu_x + Lu_x = 0, \tag{2}$$

where L is the spatial Fourier multiplier operator given by

$$\mathcal{F}(Lf)(k) = \left(\frac{\tanh(k)}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{f}(k).$$

This equation was proposed by Whitham [18] as an alternative to the Korteweg-deVries equation which features the same linear dispersion relation as the full water-wave problem, a fact that allows for the breaking of waves (Whitham [19], Naumkin & Shishmarev [15]). There have been several investigations of different variants of the Whitham equation (e.g. see Constantin & Escher [6], Gabov [10], Naumkin & Shishmarev [15] and Zaitsev [20]), but it has remained unclear whether the Whitham equation admits travelling waves, that is solutions of the form $u = u(x - \nu t)$ representing waves moving from left to right with constant speed ν. The existence of periodic travelling waves to the Whitham equation was recently established by Ehrnström & Kalisch [8], and in the present paper we discuss solitary waves, that is travelling waves for which $u(x - \nu t) \to 0$ as $x - \nu t \to \pm\infty$.

Our mathematical task is therefore to find functions $u = u(x)$ which satisfy the travelling-wave equation

$$Lu - \nu u + n(u) = 0 \tag{3}$$

with wave speed ν and asymptotic condition $u(x) \to 0$ as $x \to \pm\infty$. We examine equation (3) under the following conditions.

Assumptions

(A1) The operator L *is a Fourier multiplier with classical symbol* $m \in S^{m_0}_{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ *for some* $m_0 < 0$*, that is*

$$\mathcal{F}(Lf)(k) = m(k)\hat{f}(k)$$

for some smooth function $m\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *with the property that*

$$|m^{(\alpha)}(k)| \le C_\alpha \left(1 + |k|\right)^{m_0 - \alpha}, \qquad \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{4}$$

where C_α *is a positive constant depending upon* α*. In particular, one can write* L *as a convolution with the (possibly distributional) kernel* $K := \mathcal{F}^{-1}(m)$*, that is*

$$Lf = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} K * f. \tag{5}$$

(A2) The symbol $m : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *is even (to avoid non-real solutions) and satisfies* $m(0) > 0$*,*

$$m(k) < m(0), \qquad k \neq 0, \tag{6}$$

(so that it has a strict and positive global maximum at $k = 0$*) and*

$$m(k) = m(0) + \frac{m^{(2j_\star)}(0)}{(2j_\star)!} k^{2j_\star} + r(k)$$

for some $j_\star \in \mathbb{N}$*, where* $m^{(2j_\star)}(0) < 0$ *and* $r(k) = \mathcal{O}(k^{2j_\star+2})$ *as* $k \to 0$*.*

(A3) The nonlinearity n *is a twice continuously differentiable function* $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *with*

$$n(x) = n_p(x) + n_{\mathrm{r}}(x), \tag{7}$$

in which the leading-order part of the nonlinearity takes the form $n_p(x) = c_p|x|^p$ *for some* $c_p \neq 0$ *and* $p \in [2, 4j_\star + 1)$ *or* $n_p(x) = c_p x^p$ *for some* $c_p > 0$ *and odd integer* p *in the range* $p \in [2, 4j_\star + 1)$*, while the higher-order part of the nonlinearity satisfies the estimate*

$$n_{\mathrm{r}}(x) = \mathcal{O}(|x|^{p+\delta}), \qquad n_{\mathrm{r}}'(x) = \mathcal{O}(|x|^{p+\delta-1})$$

for some $\delta > 0$ *as* $x \to 0$*. (Occasionally we simply estimate* $n(x) = \mathcal{O}(|x|^p)$ *and* $n'(x) = \mathcal{O}(|x|^{p-1})$*.)*

Proceeding formally, let us derive a long-wave approximation to equation (3) by introducing a small parameter μ equal to the momentum $\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 \,\mathrm{d}x$ of the wave, writing ν as a small perturbation of the speed $m(0)$ of linear long waves, so that

$$\nu = m(0) + \mu^\gamma \nu_{\mathrm{lw}},$$

and substituting the weakly nonlinear *Ansatz*

$$u(x) := \mu^\alpha w(\mu^\beta x), \tag{8}$$

where $2\alpha - \beta = 1$ (so that $\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 = \mu$) into the equation. Choosing $(p-1)\alpha = 2j_\star\beta$ and $\gamma = 2j_\star\beta$, we find that

$$\mu^{p\alpha}\left(\frac{(-1)^{j_\star}}{(2j_\star)!} m^{(2j_\star)}(0) w^{(2j_\star)} - \nu_{\mathrm{lw}} w + n_p(w)\right) + \ldots = 0,$$

where the ellipsis denotes terms which are formally $o(\mu^{p\alpha})$; the constraints on α and β imply the choice

$$\alpha = \frac{2j_\star}{4j_\star + 1 - p} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \frac{p-1}{4j_\star + 1 - p}. \tag{9}$$

This formal weakly nonlinear analysis suggests that solitary-wave solutions to (1) are approximated by (suitably scaled) homoclinic solutions of the ordinary differential equation

$$\frac{(-1)^{j_\star}}{(2j_\star)!} m^{(2j_\star)}(0) w^{(2j_\star)} - \nu_{\mathrm{lw}} w + n_p(w) = 0 \tag{10}$$

for some constant ν_{lw}. The following theorem gives a variational characterisation of such solutions; it is established using a straightforward modification of the theory developed by Albert [2] and Zeng [21] for a slightly different class of equations (the proof that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}$ is bounded below over W_1 is given in the appendix).

Theorem 1.1

(i) The functional $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}} : H^{j_\star}(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$ *given by*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}(w) = -\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left\{ \frac{m^{(2j_\star)}(0)}{2(2j_\star)!}(w^{(j_\star)})^2 + N_{p+1}(w) \right\} \mathrm{d}x, \tag{11}$$

where

$$N_{p+1}(x) := \begin{cases} \dfrac{c_p x^{p+1}}{p+1}, & \text{if } n_p(x) = c_p x^p, \\[2ex] \dfrac{c_p x|x|^p}{p+1}, & \text{if } n_p(x) = c_p |x|^p, \end{cases}$$

is bounded below over the set

$$W_1 = \{ w \in H^{j_\star}(\mathbb{R}) : \mathcal{Q}(w) = 1 \},$$

where

$$\mathcal{Q}(w) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} w^2 \, \mathrm{d}x. \tag{12}$$

The set D_{lw} *of minimisers of* $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}$ *over* W_1 *is a nonempty subset of* $H^{2j_\star}(\mathbb{R})$ *which lies in*

$$W := \{ w \in H^{2j_\star}(\mathbb{R}) : \|w\|_{2j_\star} < S \}$$

for some $S > 0$*. Each element of* D_{lw} *is a solution of equation (10); the constant* ν_{lw} *is the Lagrange multiplier in this constrained variational principle.*

(ii) Suppose that $\{w_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ *is a minimising sequence for* $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}$ *over* $\{w \in H^{j_\star}(\mathbb{R}) : \mathcal{Q}(w) = 1\}$*. There exists a sequence* $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ *of real numbers with the property that a subsequence of* $\{w_n(\cdot + x_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ *converges in* $H^{j_\star}(\mathbb{R})$ *to an element of* D_{lw}*.*

For the Whitham equation ($j_\star = 1$, $p = 2$, $m''(0) = -\frac{1}{3}$) the above derivation yields the travelling-wave version

$$\tfrac{1}{6} w'' - \nu_{\mathrm{lw}} w + w^2 = 0$$

of the Korteweg-deVries equation, for which

$$D_{\mathrm{lw}} = \{ w_{\mathrm{KdV}}(\cdot + y) : y \in \mathbb{R} \}, \qquad w_{\mathrm{KdV}}(x) = \left(\tfrac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \operatorname{sech}^2\left(\left(\tfrac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} x \right)$$

(and there are no further homoclinic solutions). In general D_{lw} consists of all spatial translations of a (possibly infinite) family of 'generating' homoclinic solutions with different wave speeds ($\nu_{\mathrm{lw}} = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$ in the case of the Whitham equation).

Equation (3) also admits a variational formulation: local minimisers of the functional $\mathcal{E} : H^1(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\mathcal{E}(u) = \underbrace{-\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} uLu \, \mathrm{d}x}_{:= \mathcal{L}(u)} \underbrace{- \int_{\mathbb{R}} N(u) \, \mathrm{d}x}_{:= \mathcal{N}(u)}, \tag{13}$$

where N is the primitive function of n which vanishes at the origin, so that

$$N(x) := N_{p+1}(x) + N_{\mathrm{r}}(x), \qquad N_{\mathrm{r}}(x) := \int_0^x n_{\mathrm{r}}(s) \, \mathrm{d}s,$$

under the constraint that $\mathcal{Q}$ is held fixed are solitary-wave solutions of (3). The technique employed by Albert and Zeng, which relies upon the fact that L is of positive order (so that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}$ is coercive), is however not applicable in the present situation in which L is a smoothing operator. Instead we use methods developed by Buffoni [5] and Groves & Wahlén [11]. We consider a fixed ball

$$U = \{u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) : \|u\|_1 < R\},$$

and seek small-amplitude solutions, that is solutions in the set

$$U_\mu := \{u \in U : \ \mathcal{Q}(u) = \mu\},$$

where μ is a small, positive, real number. In particular we examine minimising sequences for $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ which do not approach the boundary of U, and establish the following result with the help of the concentration-compactness principle.

Theorem 1.2 (Existence) *There exists $\mu_\star > 0$ such that the following statements hold for each $\mu \in (0, \mu_\star)$.*

(i) The set D_μ of minimisers of $\mathcal{E}$ over the set U_μ is non-empty and the estimate $\|u\|_1^2 = \mathcal{O}(\mu)$ holds uniformly over $u \in D_\mu$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu_\star)$. Each element of D_μ is a solution of the travelling-wave equation (3); the wave speed ν is the Lagrange multiplier in this constrained variational principle. The corresponding solitary waves are supercritical, that is their speed ν exceeds $m(0)$.

(ii) Let $s < 1$ and suppose that $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is a minimising sequence for $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ with the property that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \|u_n\|_1 < R. \tag{14}$$

There exists a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ of real numbers such that a subsequence of $\{u_n(\cdot + x_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ converges in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ to a function in D_μ.

Theorem 1.2 is proved in two steps. We begin by constructing a minimising sequence which satisfies condition (14). To this end we consider the corresponding problem for periodic travelling waves (see Section 3) and penalise the variational functional so that minimising sequences do not approach the boundary of the corresponding domain in function space. Standard methods from the calculus of variations yield the existence of minimisers for the penalised problem, and *a priori* estimates confirm that the minimisers lie in the region unaffected by the penalisation; in particular they are bounded (uniformly over all large periods) away from the boundary. A minimising sequence $\{\tilde{u}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ for $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ is obtained by letting the period tend to infinity.

The minimising sequence $\{\tilde{u}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is used to show that the quantity

$$I_\mu := \inf\{\mathcal{E}(u) \colon u \in U_\mu\}$$

is *strictly subadditive*, that is

$$I_{\mu_1+\mu_2} < I_{\mu_1} + I_{\mu_2} \qquad \text{whenever } 0 < \mu_1, \mu_2 < \mu_1 + \mu_2 < \mu_\star.$$

The proof of this fact, which is presented in Section 4, is accomplished by showing that the functions $\tilde{u}_n$ 'scale' in a fashion similar to the long-wave *Ansatz* (8); we may therefore approximate $\mathcal{E}$ by a scaling of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}$ along this minimising sequence. The corresponding strict subadditivity result for the latter functional is a straightforward matter, and a perturbation argument shows that it remains valid for $\mathcal{E}$.

In a second step we apply the concentration-compactness principle to show that *any* minimising sequence satisfying (14) converges — up to subsequences and translations — in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$, $s < 1$ to a minimiser of $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ (Section 5). The strict subadditivity of I_μ is a key ingredient here. The proof of Theorem 1.2(i) is completed by *a priori* estimates for the size and speed of solitary waves obtained in this fashion.

Section 6 examines some consequences of Theorem 1.2. In particular, the relationship between the solutions to (10) found in Theorem 1.1 and the solutions to (3) found in Theorem 1.2 is rigorously clarified. Under an additional regularity hypothesis upon n we show that every solution u in the set D_μ lies in $H^{2j_\star}(\mathbb{R})$, 'scales' according to the long-wave *Ansatz* (8) and satisfies

$$\operatorname{dist}_{H^{j_\star}(\mathbb{R})}\big(\mu^{-\alpha}u(\mu^{-\beta}\cdot), D_{\mathrm{lw}}\big) \to 0$$

as $\mu \searrow 0$; the convergence is uniform over D_μ. Corresponding convergence results for the wave speeds and infima of $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}$ over $\{w \in H^{j_\star}(\mathbb{R}) : \mathcal{Q}(w) = 1\}$ are also presented. These results may contribute towards the discussion of the validity of the Whitham equation as a model for water waves: they show that the Whitham solitary waves are approximated by Korteweg-deVries solitary waves, and it is known that solutions of the Korteweg-deVries equation do approximate the solutions of the full water-wave problem (Craig [7], Schneider & Wayne [16]).

Theorem 1.2 also yields information about the stability of the set of solitary-wave solutions to (1) defined by D_μ. Observing that $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ are conserved quantities associated with equation (1), we apply a general principle that the solution set of a constrained minimisation problem of this type constitutes a stable set of solutions of the corresponding initial problem (Theorem 6.7): choosing $\operatorname{dist}_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}(u(0), D_\mu)$ sufficiently small ensures that $\operatorname{dist}_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}(u(t), D_\mu)$ remains small over the time of existence of a solution $u : [0,T] \to H^1(\mathbb{R})$ with $\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|u(t)\|_1 < R$. Of course the well-posedness of the initial-value problem for equation (1) is a prerequisite for discussing the stability of D_μ. This discussion is however outside the scope of the present paper; we merely assume that the initial-value problem is locally well posed in a sense made precise in Section 6. Our stability result is *conditional* since it applies to solutions only for as long as they remain in U (for example certain solutions of the Whitham equation (2) have only a finite time of existence (Naumkin & Shishmarev [15])), and *energetic* since distance is measured in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ rather than $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ (note that the norms in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ for $s \in [0, 1)$ are all metrically equivalent on U). Theorem 6.7 also refers to the stability of the entire set D_μ; in the special case where the minimiser of $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ is unique up to translations it coincides with (conditional and energetic) orbital stability of this solution.

2. Preliminaries

Functional-analytic setting for the solitary-wave problem

Let $SS(\mathbb{R})$ be the Schwartz space of rapidly decaying smooth functions, and let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the unitary Fourier transform on $SS(\mathbb{R})$, so that

$$\mathcal{F}(\varphi)(k) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(x) \exp(-\mathrm{i}kx)\,\mathrm{d}x, \qquad \varphi \in SS(\mathbb{R}),$$

and on the dual space of tempered distributions $SS'(\mathbb{R})$, so that $(\hat{f},\varphi) = (f,\hat{\varphi})$ for $f \in SS'(\mathbb{R})$. By $L^p(\mathbb{R})$, $p \geq 1$ we denote the space of real-valued p-integrable functions with norm $\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} := \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(x)|^p \,\mathrm{d}x$, by $H^s(\mathbb{R})$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ the real Sobolev space consisting of those tempered distributions for which the norm

$$\|f\|_s := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\hat{f}(k)|^2 \left(1+k^2\right)^s \,\mathrm{d}k \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

is finite, and by $\mathrm{BC}(\mathbb{R})$ the space of bounded and continuous real-valued functions with finite supremum norm $\|f\|_\infty := \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |f(x)|$; there is a continuous embedding $H^s(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{BC}(\mathbb{R})$ for any $s > \frac{1}{2}$, so that $\|u\|_\infty \leq c_s \|u\|_s$ for all $u \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$. We write $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ for $H^0(\mathbb{R})$, and for all spaces the subscript 'c' denotes the subspace of compactly supported functions, so that

$$H^s_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{R}) := \{ f \in H^s(\mathbb{R})\colon \mathrm{supp}(f) \text{ is compact}\}.$$

We now list some basic properties of the operators L, n appearing in equation (3) and functionals $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{Q}$ defined in equations (12), (13).

Proposition 2.1

(i) The linear operator L belongs to $C^\infty(H^s(\mathbb{R}), H^{s+|m_0|}(\mathbb{R})) \cap C^\infty(SS(\mathbb{R}), SS(\mathbb{R}))$ for each $s \geq 0$.

(ii) For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $\tilde{C}_j > 0$ such that

$$|Lu(x)| \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_j}{\left(\mathrm{dist}(x, \mathrm{supp}(u))\right)^j} \|u\|_0, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(u)$$

for all $u \in L^2_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{R})$.

(iii) Suppose that $n \in C^k(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $R > 0$ the function n induces a continuous Nemitskii operator $B_R(0) \subset H^s(\mathbb{R}) \to H^s(\mathbb{R})$, where $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, k]$.

Proof (i) This assertion follows directly from the definition of L.

(ii) Assumption (4) implies that $m^{(j)} \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Applying Plancherel's theorem and Hölder's inequality to the convolution formula (5), one finds that

$$\begin{aligned} |Lu(x)| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left| \int_{\mathrm{supp}(u)} \frac{(x-y)^j}{(x-y)^j} K(x-y) u(y)\, dy \right| \\ &\leq \frac{C_j \|m^{(j)}\|_0}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \, \frac{1}{\mathrm{dist}(x, \mathrm{supp}(u))^j} \|u\|_0. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) Construct a k times continuously differentiable function $\tilde{n} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ whose derivatives are bounded and which satisfies $\tilde{n}(x) = n(x)$ for $|x| \leq c_s R$ (for example by multiplying n by a smooth 'cut-off' function). The results given by Bourdaud & Sickel [3, Theorem 7] (for $s \in (0,1)$) and Brezis & Mironescu [4, Theorem 1.1] (for $s \geq 1$) show that $\tilde{n}$ induces a continuous Nemitskii operator $H^s(\mathbb{R}) \to H^s(\mathbb{R})$ for $s \in (0,k]$ and hence that n induces a continuous Nemitskii operator $B_R(0) \subset H^s(\mathbb{R}) \to H^s(\mathbb{R})$ for $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, k]$. □

According to the previous proposition we may study (3) as an equation in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ for $s > \frac{1}{2}$ (provided that n is sufficiently regular). In keeping with this observation we work in the fixed ball $U = \{u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) : \|u\|_1 < R\}$.

Proposition 2.2 *Suppose that* $n \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$.

(i) *The functionals* $\mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{N}$ *and* $\mathcal{Q}$ *belong to* $C^1(U,\mathbb{R})$ *and their* $L^2(\mathbb{R})$*-derivatives are given by the formulae*

$$\mathcal{L}'(u) := -Lu, \quad \mathcal{N}'(u) := -n(u), \quad \mathcal{Q}'(u) = u.$$

These formulae define functions $\mathcal{L}'$, $\mathcal{N}'$, $\mathcal{Q}' \in C(U, H^1(\mathbb{R}))$.

(ii) *The functional* $\mathcal{E}$ *belongs to* $C(H^s(\mathbb{R}),\mathbb{R})$ *for each* $s > \frac{1}{2}$.

Finally, we note that solutions of the travelling-wave equation may inherit further regularity from n.

Lemma 2.3 (Regularity) *Suppose that* $n \in C^{k+1}(\mathbb{R})$ *for some* $k \in \mathbb{N}$. *For sufficiently small values of* R*, every solution* $u \in U$ *of (3) belongs to* $H^{k+1}(\mathbb{R})$ *and satisfies*

$$\|u\|_{k+1} \leq c\|u\|_1.$$

Proof Differentiating (3), we find that

$$u' = \frac{Lu'}{\nu - n'(u)}. \tag{15}$$

There exists a positive constant c_δ such that $\nu - n'(u) \geq \delta > 0$ whenever $\|u\|_\infty < c_\delta$; the embedding $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{BC}(\mathbb{R})$ guarantees that this condition is fulfilled for each $u \in U$ for sufficiently small values of R.

Suppose that $m \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. For each fixed $u \in H^m(\mathbb{R})$ the formula

$$\varphi_u(v) = \frac{v}{\nu - n'(u)}$$

defines an operator in $B(L^2(\mathbb{R}), L^2(\mathbb{R}))$ and $B(H^m(\mathbb{R}), H^m(\mathbb{R}))$, and by interpolation it follows that $\varphi_u \in B(H^s(\mathbb{R}), H^s(\mathbb{R}))$ for $s \in [0, m]$; its norm depends upon $\|u\|_m$. Furthermore, recall that $L \in B(H^s(\mathbb{R}), H^{s+|m_0|}(\mathbb{R}))$ for all $s \in [0,\infty)$, so that

$$\psi_u := \varphi_u \circ L \in B\left(H^s(\mathbb{R}), H^{s_\star}(\mathbb{R})\right), \qquad s_\star = \min(m, s + |m_0|),$$

and the norm of ψ_u depends upon $\|u\|_m$.

It follows that any solution $w \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$ of the equation

$$w = \psi_u(w) \tag{16}$$

in fact belongs to $H^{s_\star}(\mathbb{R})$, where $s_\star = \min(m, s + |m_0|)$, and satisfies the estimate

$$\|w\|_{s_\star} \leq c_{\|u\|_m} \|w\|_s.$$

Applying this argument recursively, one finds that any solution $w \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ of (16) belongs to $H^m(\mathbb{R})$ and satisfies

$$\|w\|_m \leq c_{\|u\|_m} \|w\|_0.$$

Observe that equation (15) is equivalent to $u' = \psi_u(u')$. A bootstrap argument therefore shows that $u' \in H^k(\mathbb{R})$ with

$$\|u'\|_m \leq c_{\|u\|_1} \|u'\|_0, \qquad m = 1, \ldots, k. \qquad \square$$

Functional-analytic setting for the periodic problem

Let $P > 0$. Let L^2_P be the space of P-periodic, locally square-integrable functions with Fourier-series representation

$$u(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{P}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{u}_k \exp(2\pi \mathrm{i} kx/P),$$

and define

$$H^s_P := \left\{ u \in L^2_P \colon \|u\|_{H^s_P} := \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(1 + \frac{4\pi^2 k^2}{P^2}\right)^s |\hat{u}_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty \right\}$$

for $s \geq 0$. Just as for the Sobolev spaces $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ one has the continuous embedding $H^s_P \hookrightarrow \mathrm{BC}(\mathbb{R})$ for all $s > \frac{1}{2}$; the embedding constant is independent of P.

Proposition 2.4 *The operator L extends to an operator $SS'(\mathbb{R}) \to SS'(\mathbb{R})$ which maps H^s_P smoothly into $H^{s+|m_0|}_P$, acting on the Fourier coefficients $\hat{u}_k$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, of a function u by pointwise multiplication, so that*

$$(\widehat{Lu})_k = m(2\pi k/P)\, \hat{u}_k, \qquad k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof The operator L is symmetric on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and maps $SS(\mathbb{R})$ into itself; it therefore extends to an operator $SS'(\mathbb{R}) \to SS'(\mathbb{R})$. In particular, the convolution theorem shows that L maps P-periodic functions to P-periodic functions, acting on their Fourier coefficients by pointwise multiplication; it follows that $L \in C^\infty(H^s_P, H^{s+|m_0|}_P)$. □

There is a natural injection from the set of functions $\tilde{u}_P \in L^2_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{R})$ with $\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{u}) \subset (-\frac{P}{2}, \frac{P}{2})$ to L^2_P, namely

$$\tilde{u}_P \mapsto u_P := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{u}_P(\cdot + jP),$$

where the series converges in $SS'(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$. The following proposition shows that this map commutes with L.

Proposition 2.5 *Any function $\tilde{u}_P \in L^2_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{R})$ with $\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{u}_P) \subset (-\frac{P}{2}, \frac{P}{2})$ satisfies*

$$L^2_{\mathrm{c}} \ni \sum_{|j| \leq J} L\tilde{u}_P(\cdot + jP) \overset{J \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} Lu_P \in L^2_P$$

in $SS'(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof The convergence in $SS'(\mathbb{R})$ follows from the continuity of $L : SS'(\mathbb{R}) \to SS'(\mathbb{R})$, while that in $L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ follows from the calculation

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big\| \sum_{|j| \geq J} L\tilde{u}_P(\cdot + jP) \Big\|_{L^2((-M,M))} \\ &\quad \leq \sum_{|j| \geq J} \|L\tilde{u}_P(\cdot + jP)\|_{L^2((-M,M))} \\ &\quad \leq (2M)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{C}_2 \|\tilde{u}_P\|_0 \sum_{|j| \geq J} \frac{1}{\mathrm{dist}\left([-M,M], \mathrm{supp}(\tilde{u}(\cdot + jP))\right)^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq (2M)^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{C}_2\|\tilde{u}_P\|_0 \sum_{|j|\geq J} \frac{1}{((|j|-\frac{1}{2})P-M)^2}$$
$$\to 0$$

as $J \to \infty$. □

Define

$$U_P := \left\{u \in H_P^1\colon \|u\|_{H_P^1} < R\right\}$$

and functionals $\mathcal{N}_P$, $\mathcal{L}_P$, $\mathcal{E}_P$, $\mathcal{Q}_P\colon U_P \to \mathbb{R}$ by replacing the domain of integration in the definitions of $\mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{Q}$ by one period $(-\frac{P}{2}, \frac{P}{2})$. Observing that Proposition 2.2 (with the obvious modifications) holds for the new functionals, we study $\mathcal{E}_P$, $\mathcal{Q}_P \in C^1(U_P, \mathbb{R})$. Each minimiser of $\mathcal{E}_P$ over the set

$$U_{P,\mu} := \{u \in U_P\colon \mathcal{Q}_P(u) = \mu\}$$

is a P-periodic solution of the travelling-wave equation (3); the wave speed ν is the Lagrange multiplier in this constrained variational principle.

Additional notation

- We denote the set of functions which are square integrable over an open subset S of $\mathbb{R}$ by $L^2(S)$ and the subset of $L^2(S)$ consisting of those functions whose weak derivative exists and is square integrable by $H^1(S)$.
- The symbol c denotes a a generic constant which is independent of $\mu \in (0, \mu_\star)$ (and of course functions in a given set or sequence); its dependence upon other quantities is indicated by a subscript. All order-of-magnitude estimates are also uniform over $\mu \in (0, \mu_\star)$, and in general we replace $\mu^\star$ with a smaller number if necessary for the validity of our results.

3. The minimisation problem for periodic functions

The penalisation argument

Seeking a constrained minimiser of $\mathcal{E}_P$ in the set $U_{P,\mu}$ by the direct method of the calculus of variations, one is confronted by the difficulty that a minimising sequence may approach the boundary of U_P. To overcome this difficulty we observe that $\mathcal{E}_P$ also defines a continuously differentiable functional on the set

$$V_P := \{u \in H_P^1\colon \|u\|_{H_P^1} < 2R\}$$

and consider the auxiliary functional

$$\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}(u) := \mathcal{E}_P(u) + \varrho\left(\|u\|_{H_P^1}^2\right)$$

with constraint set

$$V_{P,\mu} := \left\{u \in H_P^1\colon \|u\|_{H_P^1} < 2R,\ \mathcal{Q}(u) = \mu\right\},$$

where we note the helpful estimate

$$\|u\|_\infty \leq c\|u\|_{L_P^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|u\|_{H_P^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c\mu^{\frac{1}{4}}, \qquad u \in V_{P,\mu}. \tag{17}$$

Here $\varrho\colon [0,(2R)^2) \to [0,\infty)$ is a smooth, increasing ‘penalisation’ function such that

(i) $\varrho(t) = 0$ whenever $0 \leq t \leq R^2$,

(ii) $\varrho(t) \to \infty$ as $t \nearrow (2R)^2$,

(iii) for every constant $a_1 \in (0,1)$ there exist $M_1, M_2 > 0$ and $a_2 > 1$ such that

$$\varrho'(t) \leq M_1(\varrho(t))^{a_1} + M_2(\varrho(t))^{a_2};$$

an example of such a function ϱ can be obtained by scaling and translating the function

$$t \mapsto \begin{cases} (1-t)^{-1}\exp(-1/t), & t \in (0,1), \\ 0, & t \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

The following lemma is obtained by standard weak continuity arguments (e.g. see Struwe [17, §§I.1, I.2]).

Lemma 3.1 *The functional* $\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}\colon V_{P,\mu} \to \mathbb{R}$ *is weakly lower semicontinuous, bounded from below, and satisfies* $\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}(u) \to \infty$ *as* $\|u\|_{H^1_P} \nearrow 2R$*. In particular, it has a minimiser* $\bar{u}_P \in V_{P,\mu}$*.*

The next step is to show that $\bar{u}_P$ in fact minimises $\mathcal{E}_P$ over $U_{P,\mu}$. This result relies upon estimates for $\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}$ which are uniform in P and are derived in Lemmata 3.2 and 3.3 and Corollary 3.4 by examining the functional $\mathcal{E}$ and its relationship to $\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}$.

Lemma 3.2 *For any* $w \in W$ *the 'long-wave test function'* $S_{\mathrm{lw}}w$*, where*

$$(S_{\mathrm{lw}}w)(x) = \mu^\alpha w(\mu^\beta x),$$

lies in U *and satisfies*

$$\mathcal{E}(S_{\mathrm{lw}}w) = -\mu m(0) + \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}(w) + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}),$$

where the values of α *and* β *are given by (9) and* $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}$ *is defined in equation (11). The estimate holds uniformly over* $w \in W$*, and* $w \in W_1$ *implies* $u \in U_\mu$*.*

Proof Observe that

$$\mathcal{Q}(S_{\mathrm{lw}}w) = \mu^{2\alpha-\beta}, \qquad \mathcal{F}[S_{\mathrm{lw}}w](k) = \mu^{\alpha-\beta}\hat{w}(\mu^{-\beta}k)$$

and

$$\|S_{\mathrm{lw}}w\|_1^2 = \mu^{2\alpha-\beta}\|w\|_0^2 + \mu^{2\alpha+\beta}\|w'\|_0^2 \leq c\mu$$

for $\alpha, \beta > 0$ with $2\alpha - \beta \geq 1$. A direct calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(S_{\mathrm{lw}}w) = & -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} m(k)\,|\mathcal{F}[S_{\mathrm{lw}}w](k)|^2\,\mathrm{d}k - \mu^{-\beta}\int_{\mathbb{R}} N\left(\mu^\alpha w(x)\right)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ = & -\mu^{2\alpha-\beta}m(0) - \frac{\mu^{2\alpha+(2j_\star-1)\beta}\,m^{(2j_\star)}(0)}{2(2j_\star)!}\int_{\mathbb{R}} k^{2j_\star}|\hat{w}(k)|^2\,\mathrm{d}k \\ & -\mu^{(p+1)\alpha-\beta}\int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{p+1}(w(x))\,\mathrm{d}x \\ & -\mu^{-\beta}\int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{\mathrm{r}}(\mu^\alpha w(x))\,\mathrm{d}x - \frac{\mu^{2\alpha-\beta}}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} r(\mu^\beta k)|\hat{w}(k)|^2\,\mathrm{d}k, \end{aligned}$$

and one can estimate

$$\left|\frac{\mu^{2\alpha-\beta}}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} r(\mu^\beta k)|\hat{w}(k)|^2\,\mathrm{d}k + \mu^{-\beta}\int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{\mathrm{r}}(\mu^\alpha w(x))\,\mathrm{d}x\right|$$
$$\leq c\left(\mu^{2\alpha+(2j_\star+1)\beta}\int_{\mathbb{R}} k^{2j_\star+2}|\hat{w}(k)|^2\,\mathrm{d}k + \mu^{(p+\delta+1)\alpha-\beta}\int_{\mathbb{R}}|w(x)|^{p+\delta+1}\,\mathrm{d}x\right).$$

Choosing α and β such that $(p-1)\alpha = 2j_\star\beta$ and $2\alpha-\beta = 1$, so that α and β are given by (9), yields the desired estimate. □

Lemma 3.3 *Let $\{\tilde{u}_P\}_P$ be a bounded family of functions in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ with*

$$\operatorname{supp}(\tilde{u}_P) \subset (-\tfrac{P}{2}, \tfrac{P}{2}) \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{dist}(\pm\tfrac{P}{2}, \operatorname{supp}(\tilde{u}_P)) \geq \frac{1}{2}P^{\frac{1}{4}}$$

and define $u_P \in H_1^P$ by the formula

$$u_P = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \tilde{u}_P(\cdot + jP).$$

(i) The function u_P satisfies

$$\lim_{P\to\infty}\|L\tilde{u}_P - Lu_P\|_{H^1(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} = 0, \qquad \lim_{P\to\infty}\|L\tilde{u}_P\|_{H^1(\{|x|>\frac{P}{2}\})} = 0,$$

(ii) The functionals $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{E}_P$, $\mathcal{Q}_P$ have the properties that

$$\lim_{P\to\infty}(\mathcal{E}(\tilde{u}_P) - \mathcal{E}_P(u_P)) = 0, \qquad \mathcal{Q}(\tilde{u}_P) = \mathcal{Q}_P(u_P)$$

and

$$\lim_{P\to\infty}\|\mathcal{E}'(\tilde{u}_P) - \mathcal{E}_P'(u_P)\|_{H^1(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} = 0, \qquad \lim_{P\to\infty}\|\mathcal{E}'(\tilde{u}_P)\|_{H^1(\{|x|>\frac{P}{2}\})} = 0,$$
$$\|\mathcal{Q}'(\tilde{u}_P) - \mathcal{Q}_P'(u_P)\|_{H^1(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} = 0, \qquad \|\mathcal{Q}'(\tilde{u}_P)\|_{H^1(\{|x|>\frac{P}{2}\})} = 0.$$

Proof (i) Using Proposition 2.1(ii), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} |L\tilde{u}_P - Lu_P|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\qquad = \int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \Big|\sum_{|j|\geq 1} L\tilde{u}_P(x+jP)\Big|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&\qquad \leq \int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \left(\sum_{|j|\geq 1}\frac{\tilde{C}_3\|\tilde{u}_P\|_0}{\operatorname{dist}\left(x+jP, \operatorname{supp}(\tilde{u}_P)\right)^3}\right)^2\mathrm{d}x\\
&\qquad \leq \int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \left(2\sum_{j\geq 0}\frac{\tilde{C}_3\|\tilde{u}_P\|_0}{\left(jP+\frac{1}{2}P^{\frac{1}{4}}\right)^3}\right)^2\mathrm{d}x\\
&\qquad \to 0,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\int_{|x|>\frac{P}{2}} |L\tilde{u}_P|^2\,\mathrm{d}x$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \tilde{C}_1^2 \|\tilde{u}_P\|_0^2 \int_{|x|>\frac{P}{2}} \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\operatorname{dist}(x, \operatorname{supp}(\tilde{u}_P))^2} \\
&\leq \tilde{C}_1^2 \|\tilde{u}_P\|_0^2 \int_{|x|>\frac{P}{2}} \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\left(|x| - \frac{1}{2}(P - P^{\frac{1}{4}})\right)^2} \\
&= \frac{4\tilde{C}_1^2 \|\tilde{u}_P\|_0^2}{P^{\frac{1}{4}}} \\
&\to 0
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{P\to\infty} \|L\tilde{u}_P - Lu_P\|_{L^2(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} = 0, \qquad \lim_{P\to\infty} \|L\tilde{u}_P\|_{L^2(\{|x|>\frac{P}{2}\})} = 0,$$

as $P \to \infty$. The same calculation is valid with u_P and $\tilde{u}_P$ replaced by respectively u_P' and $\tilde{u}_P'$, and since L commutes with differentiation this observation completes the proof.

(ii) Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathcal{L}(\tilde{u}_P) - \mathcal{L}_P(u_P)| \\
&\quad = \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{u}_P L \tilde{u}_P \, \mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} u_P L u_P \, \mathrm{d}x \right| \\
&\quad = \left| \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \tilde{u}_P (L\tilde{u}_P - Lu_P) \, \mathrm{d}x \right| \\
&\quad \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{u}_P\|_0 \|L\tilde{u}_P - Lu_P\|_{L^2(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} \\
&\quad \to 0
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{L}'(\tilde{u}_P) - \mathcal{L}_P'(u_P)\|_{H^1(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} = \|L\tilde{u}_P - Lu_P\|_{H^1(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} \to 0,$$
$$\|\mathcal{L}'(\tilde{u}_P)\|_{H^1(\{|x|>\frac{P}{2}\})} = \|L\tilde{u}_P\|_{H^1(\{|x|>\frac{P}{2}\})} \to 0$$

as $P \to \infty$. Furthermore

$$\mathcal{N}(\tilde{u}_P) = -\int_{\mathbb{R}} N(\tilde{u}_P) \, \mathrm{d}x = -\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} N(\tilde{u}_P) \, \mathrm{d}x = -\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} N(u_P) \, \mathrm{d}x = \mathcal{N}_P(u_P)$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}'(\tilde{u}_P(x)) = -n(\tilde{u}_P(x)) = \begin{cases} -n(u_P(x)) = \mathcal{N}_P'(u_P(x)), & x \in (-\frac{P}{2}, \frac{P}{2}), \\ 0, & |x| \geq \frac{P}{2}, \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{N}'(\tilde{u}_P))'(x) &= -n'(\tilde{u}_P(x))\tilde{u}_P'(x) \\
&= \begin{cases} -n'(u_P(x))u_P'(x) = (\mathcal{N}_P'(u_P))'(x), & x \in (-\frac{P}{2}, \frac{P}{2}), \\ 0, & |x| \geq \frac{P}{2}, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\|\mathcal{N}'(\tilde{u}_P) - \mathcal{N}_P'(u_P)\|_{H^1(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} = 0, \qquad \|\mathcal{N}'(\tilde{u}_P)\|_{H^1(\{|x|>\frac{P}{2}\})} = 0.$$

The result for $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{E}_P$ follows from these calculations and the formulae $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{E}_P = \mathcal{L}_P + \mathcal{N}_P$, and a similar calculation yields the result for $\mathcal{Q}$, $\mathcal{Q}_P$. □

Corollary 3.4 *There exist constants* $I_\star > 0$ *and* $P_\mu > 0$ *such that*

$$I_\mu := \inf\{\mathcal{E}(u)\colon u \in U_\mu\} < -\mu m(0) - \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha} I_\star$$

and

$$I_{P,\varrho,\mu} := \inf\{\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}(u)\colon u \in V_{P,\mu}\} < -\mu m(0) - \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha} I_\star$$

for each $P \geq P_\mu$.

Proof Taking $\psi \in C_\mathrm{c}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\mathcal{Q}(\psi) = 1$ and writing $w(x) = \sqrt{\lambda}\psi(\lambda x)$, one finds that

$$\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{lw}(w) = -\lambda^{2j_\star}\frac{m^{(2j_\star)}(0)}{2(2j_\star)!}\int_\mathbb{R}(\psi^{(j_\star)})^2\,\mathrm{d}x - \lambda^{(p-1)/2}\int_\mathbb{R} N_{p+1}(\psi)\,\mathrm{d}x < 0$$

for sufficiently small values of λ provided that $p < 4j_\star + 1$ and $N_{p+1}(\psi) > 0$; these conditions are satisfied under assumption (A3) by choosing $\psi > 0$ if $c_p > 0$ and $\psi < 0$ if $c_p < 0$.

Noting that $w \in W$ for sufficiently large values of S, we find from Lemma 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(S_\mathrm{lw}w) + \mu m(0) &= \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{lw}(w) + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha})\\ &< \tfrac{1}{2}\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{lw}(w).\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Observe that $\operatorname{supp}(S_\mathrm{lw}w) = \mu^{-\beta}\operatorname{supp}(w)$, so that $S_\mathrm{lw}w$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.3 if and only if $\mu^\beta P \geq c_w$, where c_w is a positive constant independent of P. For such P a combination of Lemma 3.3 and (18) yields

$$\begin{aligned}I_{P,\varrho,\mu} &\leq \mathcal{E}_P(u_P)\\ &\leq -\mu m(0) + \tfrac{1}{2}\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{lw}(w) + (\mathcal{E}_P(u_P) - \mathcal{E}(S_\mathrm{lw}w))\\ &\to -\mu m(0) + \tfrac{1}{2}\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{lw}(w)\end{aligned}$$

as $P \to \infty$, where

$$u_P = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}(S_\mathrm{lw}w)(\cdot + jP).$$

The result follows by setting $I_\star := -\frac{1}{4}\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{lw}(w)$ and choosing P_μ large enough so that $\mu^\beta P \geq c_w$ and $|\mathcal{E}_P(u_P) - \mathcal{E}(S_\mathrm{lw}w)| < \frac{1}{4}\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}|\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{lw}(w)|$ for $P \geq P_\mu$ (see Lemma 3.3(ii)). □

Let us now return to our study of minimisers $\bar{u}_P$ of $\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}$ over $V_{P,\mu}$, which in view of Corollary 3.4 satisfy

$$\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}(\bar{u}_P) < -\mu m(0) - \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha} I_\star \tag{19}$$

and of course

$$\mathrm{d}\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}[\bar{u}_P] + \nu_P\mathrm{d}\mathcal{Q}_P[\bar{u}_P] = 0 \tag{20}$$

for some constant $\nu_P \in \mathbb{R}$, that is

$$\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}}(L\bar{u}_P + n(\bar{u}_P))\,v\,\mathrm{d}x - 2\varrho'\big(\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2\big)\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}}(\bar{u}_P v + \bar{u}_P' v')\,\mathrm{d}x = \nu_P\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}}\bar{u}_P v\,\mathrm{d}x$$

for all $v \in H_P^1$. This equation implies that $\bar{u}_P''$ exists if $\varrho'\big(\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2\big) > 0$ and that $\bar{u}_P$ satisfies the equation

$$\nu_P\bar{u}_P = L\bar{u}_P + n(\bar{u}_P) - 2\varrho'\big(\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2\big)\left(\bar{u}_P - \bar{u}_P''\right). \tag{21}$$

Lemma 3.5 *The estimate*

$$\nu_P - m(0) > \tfrac{1}{2}I_\star(p+1)\mu^{(p-1)\alpha} + \mathcal{O}(\|\bar{u}_P\|_\infty^{p+\delta-1}) - c_\varrho \mu^{1+\varepsilon}$$

holds uniformly over the set of minimisers $\bar{u}_P$ of $\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}$ over $V_{P,\mu}$ and $P \geq P_\mu$. Here ε is a positive constant and c_ϱ vanishes when $\varrho = 0$.

Proof In this proof all estimates hold uniformly in $P \geq P_\mu$.

Inequality (19) asserts that

$$-\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} N(\bar{u}_P)\,\mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{2}\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \bar{u}_P L\bar{u}_P\,\mathrm{d}x + \varrho\big(\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2\big) < -m(0)\mu,$$

for all $P \geq P_\mu$, and assumption (6) implies that

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \bar{u}_P L\bar{u}_P\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \frac{m(0)}{2}\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \bar{u}_P^2\,\mathrm{d}x = m(0)\mu. \tag{22}$$

Adding these inequalities, we find that

$$\varrho\big(\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2\big) \leq \int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} N(\bar{u}_P)\,\mathrm{d}x \leq c\|\bar{u}_P\|_\infty^{p-1}\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \bar{u}_P^2\,\mathrm{d}x \leq c\mu^{(p+3)/4},$$

where we have estimated $\|\bar{u}_P\|_\infty \leq c\mu^{\frac{1}{4}}$ (see (17)). Using property (iii) of the penalisation function, we conclude that

$$\varrho'\big(\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2\big) \leq c\mu^{1+\varepsilon}. \tag{23}$$

Multiplying (21) by $\bar{u}_P$ and integrating over $(-\frac{P}{2}, \frac{P}{2})$, one finds that

$$\begin{aligned}
2\nu_P\mu = {} & (p+1)\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{2}\bar{u}_P L\bar{u}_P + N(\bar{u}_P)\right)\mathrm{d}x - \frac{p-1}{2}\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \bar{u}_P L\bar{u}_P\,\mathrm{d}x \\
& - \int_{\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \left((p+1)N(\bar{u}_P) - \bar{u}_P n(\bar{u}_P)\right)\mathrm{d}x - 2\varrho'\big(\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2\big)\,\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2 \\
= {} & -(p+1)\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}(\bar{u}_P) - \frac{p-1}{2}\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \bar{u}_P L\bar{u}_P\,\mathrm{d}x + (p+1)\varrho\big(\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2\big) \\
& + \mathcal{O}(\|\bar{u}_P\|_\infty^{p+\delta-1}\|\bar{u}_P\|_{L_P^2}^2) - 2\varrho'\big(\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2\big)\,\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2
\end{aligned}$$

because $(p+1)N(u(x)) - un(u(x)) = \mathcal{O}(|u(x)|^{p+\delta+1})$ uniformly over $u \in V_P$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that

$$\nu_P > m(0) + \tfrac{1}{2}I_\star(p+1)\mu^{(p-1)\alpha} + O(\|\bar{u}_P\|_\infty^{p+\delta-1}) - c\mu^{1+\varepsilon},$$

where we have used inequalities (19), (22) and (23). □

It follows from Lemma 3.5 and the estimate $\|\bar{u}_P\|_\infty \leq c\mu^{\frac{1}{4}}$ (see (17)) that $\nu_P > \frac{3}{4}m(0)$ uniformly over the set of minimisers $\bar{u}_P$ of $\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}$ over $V_{P,\mu}$ and $P \geq P_\mu$. This bound is used in the following estimate of the size of $\bar{u}_P$.

Lemma 3.6 *The estimate*

$$\|\bar{u}_P\|_1^2 \leq c\mu$$

holds uniformly over the set of minimisers of $\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}$ over $V_{P,\mu}$ and $P \geq P_\mu$.

Proof In this proof all estimates again hold uniformly in $P \geq P_\mu$.

Multiplying (21) by $\bar{u}_P - \bar{u}_P''$ if $\varrho'\big(\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2\big) > 0$ or applying the operator $\bar{u}_P + \bar{u}_P' \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}$ if $\varrho'\big(\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2\big) = 0$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_P \|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2 &= \int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} (\bar{u}_P L \bar{u}_P + \bar{u}_P' L \bar{u}_P')\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \big(\bar{u}_P n(\bar{u}_P) + |\bar{u}_P'|^2 n'(\bar{u}_P)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\qquad - 2\varrho'\big(\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2\big)\left(\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^2}^2 + 2\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} |\bar{u}_P'|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\right) \\ &\leq c\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^{1+\frac{m_0}{2}}}^2 + \left(\sup_{|x| \leq \|\bar{u}_P\|_\infty} |n'(x)|\right)\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2\end{aligned}$$

because $m \in S_\infty^{m_0}(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$|n(u_P(x))| \leq \left(\sup_{|x| \leq \|\bar{u}_P\|_\infty} |n'(x)|\right)|u_P(x)|$$

uniformly over $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Because $\sup_{|x|\leq\|\bar{u}_P\|_\infty} |n'(x)| \to 0$ as $\|\bar{u}_P\|_\infty \to 0$ and hence as $\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1} \to 0$ this quantity is bounded by $\frac{3}{4}m(0)$ for sufficiently small values of R, so that

$$\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2 \leq c\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^{1+\frac{m_0}{2}}}^2.$$

Estimating

$$\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^{1+\frac{m_0}{2}}}^2 \leq \begin{cases} \|\bar{u}_P\|_{L_P^2}^{|m_0|}\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^{2-|m_0|}, & |m_0| < 2, \\ \|\bar{u}_P\|_{L_P^2}^2, & |m_0| \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

shows that

$$\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2 \leq c\|\bar{u}_P\|_{L_P^2}^2 \leq c\mu. \qquad \square$$

Theorem 3.7 (Existence of periodic minimisers) *For each $P \geq P_\mu$ there exists a function $\bar{u}_P \in U_{P,\mu}$ which minimises $\mathcal{E}_P$ over $U_{P,\mu}$, so that*

$$\mathcal{E}_P(\bar{u}_P) = I_{P,\mu} := \inf\{\mathcal{E}_P(u) \colon u \in U_{P,\mu}\},$$

and satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\mathcal{E}_P'(\bar{u}_P) + \nu_P \mathcal{Q}_P'(\bar{u}_P) = 0$$

for some real number ν_P; it is therefore a periodic solution of the travelling-wave equation (3) with wave speed ν_P. Furthermore

$$\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2 \leq c\mu, \qquad 0 < \nu_P \leq c$$

uniformly over $P \geq P_\mu$.

Proof Let $\bar{u}_P$ be a minimiser of $\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}$ over $V_{P,\mu}$. It follows from Lemma 3.6 that $\|\bar{u}_P\|_1^2 \leq c\mu$, so that $\varrho(\bar{u}_P)$ and $\varrho'(\bar{u}_P)$ vanish. In particular, $\bar{u}_P$ belongs to $U_{P,\mu}$, and since it minimises $\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho}$ over $V_{P,\mu}$ it certainly minimises $\mathcal{E}_{P,\varrho} = \mathcal{E}_P$ over $U_{P,\mu}$. Furthermore, equation (20) is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{E}_P'(\bar{u}_P) + \nu_P \mathcal{Q}_P'(\bar{u}_P) = 0,$$

from which it follows that

$$\nu_P = -\frac{1}{2\mu}\langle \mathcal{E}_P'(\bar{u}_P), \bar{u}_P\rangle_{L_P^2} \leq \frac{c}{\mu}\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H_P^1}^2 \leq c. \qquad \square$$

Construction of a special minimising sequence for $\mathcal{E}$

We proceed by extending the minimisers $\bar{u}_P$ of $\mathcal{E}_P$ over $U_{P,\mu}$ found above to functions in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ by scaling, translation and truncation in the following manner. For each sufficiently large value of P there exists an open subinterval $I_P := (x_P - \frac{1}{2}P^{\frac{1}{4}}, x_P + \frac{1}{2}P^{\frac{1}{4}})$ of $(-\frac{P}{8}, \frac{P}{8})$ such that $\|\bar{u}_P\|_{H^1(I_P)} < P^{-\frac{1}{4}}$; we may assume that this property holds for all $P \geq P_\mu$. Let $\chi\colon [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ be a smooth, increasing 'cut-off' function with

$$\chi(r) := \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \leq r \leq 1/2, \\ 1, & r \geq 1, \end{cases},$$

let u_P be the P-periodic function defined by

$$u_P(x) := A_P v_P\left(x + \tfrac{P}{2}\right),$$

where

$$v_P(x)|_{[-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2}]} := \chi\left(\frac{2|x|}{P^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right)\bar{u}_P(x + x_P), \qquad A_P = \frac{\sqrt{2\mu}}{\|v_P\|_{L^2_P}},$$

and finally define $\tilde{u}_P \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ by the formula

$$\tilde{u}_P(x) := \begin{cases} u_P(x), & |x| \leq \frac{P}{2}, \\ 0, & |x| > \frac{P}{2}, \end{cases}$$

so that

$$u_P = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \tilde{u}_P(\cdot + jP).$$

Let us examine the sequence $\{\tilde{u}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$, where $\tilde{u}_n := \tilde{u}_{P_n}$ and $\{P_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is an increasing, unbounded sequence of positive real numbers with $P_0 \geq P_\mu$.

Theorem 3.8 (Special minimising sequence for $\mathcal{E}$) *The sequence $\{\tilde{u}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is a minimising sequence for $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ which satisfies*

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \|\tilde{u}_n\|_1^2 \leq c\mu, \qquad \lim_{n\to\infty} \|\mathcal{E}'(\tilde{u}_n) + \nu_n \mathcal{Q}'(\tilde{u}_n)\|_1 = 0,$$

where $\nu_n = \nu_{P_n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\|u_P - \bar{u}_P\left(\cdot + x_P + \tfrac{P}{2}\right)\right\|_{L^2_P}^2 \\ &\quad= \int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \left|A_P\,\chi\left(\frac{2|x|}{P^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right) - 1\right|^2 |\bar{u}_P(x + x_P)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad= \int_{|x|<\frac{1}{2}P^{\frac{1}{4}}} \left|A_P\,\chi\left(\frac{2|x|}{P^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right) - 1\right|^2 |\bar{u}_P(x + x_P)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\qquad\quad + |A_P - 1|^2 \underbrace{\int_{|x|>\frac{1}{2}P^{\frac{1}{4}}} |\bar{u}_P(x + x_P)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x}_{\leq \|\bar{u}_P\|_{H^1_P}^2 < R} \\ &\quad\to 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $P \to \infty$; the first integral vanishes by the choice of the intervals I_P, while the factor $A_P - 1$ also vanishes because $\lim_{P\to\infty} \|v_P\|_{L^2_P} = \lim_{P\to\infty} \|\bar{u}_P\|_{L^2_P} = \sqrt{2\mu}$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|u_P' - \bar{u}_P'\left(\cdot + x_P + \tfrac{P}{2}\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_P} \\
&\quad= \int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \left|A_P\,\chi\left(\frac{2|x|}{P^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right) - 1\right|^2 |\bar{u}_P'(x+x_P)|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\qquad + \frac{4}{P^{\frac{1}{2}}}\int_{-\frac{P}{2}}^{\frac{P}{2}} \left|A_P\,\chi'\left(\frac{2|x|}{P^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right)\right|^2 |\bar{u}_P(x+x_P)|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad\to 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $P \to \infty$ (the above argument shows that the first integral vanishes, while the second integral is bounded). It follows that

$$\left\|u_P - \bar{u}_P\left(\cdot + x_P + \tfrac{P}{2}\right)\right\|_{H^1_P} \to 0 \qquad \text{as } P \to \infty,$$

and this result shows in particular that

$$\|\tilde{u}_P\|_1 = \|u_P\|_{H^1_P} \leq \left\|u_P - \bar{u}_P\left(\cdot + x_P + \tfrac{P}{2}\right)\right\|_{H^1_P} + \|\bar{u}_P\|_{H^1_P} \leq c\mu$$

for $P \geq P_\mu$ (where P_μ is replaced with a larger constant if necessary).

Next note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_P(u_P) - \mathcal{E}_P(\bar{u}_P) &= \mathcal{E}_P(u_P) - \mathcal{E}_P\left(\bar{u}_P\left(\cdot + x_P + \tfrac{P}{2}\right)\right) \\
&\leq \sup_{u\in U_P} \|\mathcal{E}_P'(u)\|_{L^2_P} \left\|u_P - \bar{u}_P\left(\cdot + x_P + \tfrac{P}{2}\right)\right\|_{L^2_P} \\
&\to 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $P \to \infty$ (because $\|\mathcal{E}_P'(u)\|_{L^2_P}$ is bounded uniformly over $u \in U_P$ and $P > 0$) and

$$\mathcal{E}(\tilde{u}_P) - \mathcal{E}_P(u_P) \to 0$$

as $P \to \infty$ (Lemma 3.3(ii)). Observe further that $I_{P,\mu} \to I_\mu$ as $P \to \infty$:

- Take $\tilde{w} \in C^\infty_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{R})$ with $\mathcal{Q}(\tilde{w}) = \mu$, so that $w_P := \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \tilde{w}(\cdot + jP)$ satisfies $I_{P,\mu} \leq \mathcal{E}_P(w_P)$ and $\mathcal{E}_P(w_P) \to \mathcal{E}(\tilde{w})$ as $P \to \infty$ (see Lemma 3.3(ii)). It follows that $\limsup_{P\to\infty} I_{P,\mu} \leq \mathcal{E}(\tilde{w})$, and hence that

  $$\limsup_{P\to\infty} I_{P,\mu} \leq \inf\left\{\mathcal{E}(\tilde{u}) \colon \tilde{u} \in C^\infty_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{R}) \cap U_\mu\right\} = I_\mu.$$

- On the other hand,

  $$\begin{aligned}
  I_\mu &\leq \mathcal{E}(\tilde{u}_P) \\
  &= (\mathcal{E}(\tilde{u}_P) - \mathcal{E}_P(u_P)) + (\mathcal{E}_P(u_P) - \mathcal{E}_P(\bar{u}_P)) + I_{P,\mu},
  \end{aligned}$$

  in which the first and second terms on the right-hand side vanish as $P \to \infty$, so that

  $$I_\mu \leq \liminf_{P\to\infty} I_{P,\mu}.$$

We conclude that

$$\mathcal{E}(\tilde{u}_P) = (\mathcal{E}(\tilde{u}_P) - \mathcal{E}_P(u_P)) + (\mathcal{E}_P(u_P) - \mathcal{E}_P(\bar{u}_P)) + I_{P,\mu} \to I_\mu$$

as $P \to \infty$.

Similarly, note that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{E}_P'(u_P) - \mathcal{E}_P'(\bar{u}_P)\|_{H_P^1} &= \left\|\mathcal{E}_P'(u_P) - \mathcal{E}_P'\left(\bar{u}_P\left(\cdot + x_P + \tfrac{P}{2}\right)\right)\right\|_{H_P^1} \\ &\leq \sup_{u \in U_P} \|\mathrm{d}\mathcal{E}_P'[u]\|_{H_P^1 \to H_P^1} \left\|u_P - \bar{u}_P\left(\cdot + x_P + \tfrac{P}{2}\right)\right\|_{H_P^1} \\ &\to 0\end{aligned}$$

as $P \to \infty$ (it follows from the calculation $\mathrm{d}\mathcal{E}_P'[u](v) = -Lv - n'(u)v$ that

$$\|\mathrm{d}\mathcal{E}_P'[u]\|_{H_P^1 \to H_P^1} \leq c\left(m(0) + \sup_{|x| \leq c_s R} |n'(x)| + \sup_{|x| \leq c_s R} |n''(x)|\right) \leq c \tag{24}$$

uniformly over $u \in U_P$ and $P > 0$), and Lemma 3.3(ii) shows that

$$\lim_{P \to \infty} \|\mathcal{E}'(\tilde{u}_P) - \mathcal{E}_P'(u_P)\|_{H^1(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} = 0, \qquad \lim_{P \to \infty} \|\mathcal{E}'(\tilde{u}_P)\|_{H^1(\{|x| > \frac{P}{2}\})} = 0;$$

the same results hold for $\mathcal{Q}$, $\mathcal{Q}_P$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\mathcal{E}'(\tilde{u}_P) + \nu_P \mathcal{Q}'(\tilde{u}_P)\|_1 \\ &\quad\leq \|\mathcal{E}'(\tilde{u}_P) - \mathcal{E}_P'(u_P)\|_{H^1(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} + \nu_P\|\mathcal{Q}'(\tilde{u}_P) - \mathcal{Q}_P'(u_P)\|_{H^1(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} \\ &\qquad + \|\mathcal{E}_P'(u_P) - \mathcal{E}_P'(\bar{u}_P)\|_{H^1(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} + \nu_P\|\mathcal{Q}_P'(u_P) - \mathcal{Q}_P'(\bar{u}_P)\|_{H^1(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} \\ &\qquad + \|\mathcal{E}_P'(\bar{u}_P) + \nu_P \mathcal{Q}_P'(\bar{u}_P)\|_{H^1(-\frac{P}{2},\frac{P}{2})} + \|\mathcal{E}'(\tilde{u}_P)\|_{H^1(\{|x| > \frac{P}{2}\})} \\ &\qquad + \nu_P\|\mathcal{Q}'(\tilde{u}_P)\|_{H^1(\{|x| > \frac{P}{2}\})} \\ &\quad\to 0\end{aligned}$$

as $P \to \infty$ because $\{\nu_P\}$ is bounded. □

4. Strict subadditivity

In this section we show that the quantity

$$I_\mu := \inf\{\mathcal{E}(u) \colon u \in U_\mu\}$$

is *strictly subadditive*, that is

$$I_{\mu_1+\mu_2} < I_{\mu_1} + I_{\mu_2} \qquad \text{whenever } 0 < \mu_1, \mu_2 < \mu_1 + \mu_2 < \mu_\star.$$

This result is needed in Section 5 below to exclude 'dichotomy' when applying the concentration-compactness principle to a minimising sequence $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ for $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ. It is proved by approximating the nonlinear term $\mathcal{N}(u_n)$ by its leading-order homogeneous part $-\int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{p+1}(u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x$ (strict subadditivity for a problem with a homogeneous nonlinearity follows by a straightforward scaling argument). However, the requisite estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{\mathrm{r}}(u_n)\,\mathrm{d}x = o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha})$$

may not hold for a general minimising sequence; it does however hold for the special minimising sequence $\{\tilde{u}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ constructed in Section 3 above.

Scaling

We now examine functions $u \in U_\mu$ which are 'near minimisers' of $\mathcal{E}$ in the sense that

$$\mathcal{E}(u) < -\mu m(0) - I_\star \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}, \qquad \|\mathcal{E}'(u) + \nu \mathcal{Q}'(u)\|_1 \leq c\mu^N \qquad (25)$$

for some $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ and natural number $N \geq \max\{\frac{1}{2}(1+4j_\star\beta), 1+(p-1)\alpha\}$. We show that their low-wavenumber part is a long wave which 'scales' in a fashion similar to the *Ansatz* (8); this result allows us to conclude in particular that $\|u\|_\infty \leq c\mu^{\alpha-\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ (see Corollary 4.5).

Our results are obtained by studying the identity

$$\nu u - Lu = n(u) + \mathcal{E}'(u) + \nu \mathcal{Q}'(u); \qquad (26)$$

they apply to minimisers u of $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ, for which $\mathcal{E}'(u) + \nu\mathcal{Q}'(u) = 0$ for some Lagrange multiplier ν, and to the functions $\tilde{u}_n$ in the minimising sequence $\{\tilde{u}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$, which satisfy $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\mathcal{E}(\tilde{u}_n) + \nu_n \mathcal{Q}(\tilde{u}_n)\|_1 = 0$. (Without loss of generality we may assume that ν_n does not depend upon n: the bounded sequence $\{\nu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ has a convergent subsequence whose limit ν satisfies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\mathcal{E}'(\tilde{u}_n) + \nu \mathcal{Q}'(\tilde{u}_n)\|_1 = 0$$

because $\{\|\mathcal{Q}'(\tilde{u}_n)\|_1\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is bounded.)

We begin with the following preliminary result, which is proved in the same fashion as Lemma 3.5.

Proposition 4.1 *The estimate*

$$\nu - m(0) > \tfrac{1}{2} I_\star (p+1)\mu^{(p-1)\alpha} + \mathcal{O}(\|u\|_\infty^{p+\delta-1}) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{N-\frac{1}{2}})$$

holds uniformly over the set of $u \in U_\mu$ satisfying (25).

According to Proposition 4.1 one may replace (25) by

$$\nu - m(0) > \mathcal{O}(\|u\|_\infty^{p+\delta-1}), \qquad \|\mathcal{E}'(u) + \nu\mathcal{Q}'(u)\|_1 \leq c\mu^N, \qquad (27)$$

and most of the results in the present section apply to this more general situation. In particular, estimating

$$\|u\|_\infty \leq c\|u\|_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c\mu^{\frac{1}{4}}, \qquad u \in U_\mu$$

we find that $\nu > \frac{3}{4}m(0)$; our next result is obtained from this bound in the same fashion as Lemma 3.6.

Proposition 4.2 *The estimate*

$$\|u\|_1^2 \leq c\mu$$

holds uniformly over the set of $u \in U_\mu$ satisfying (27).

The next step is to decompose a function $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ into low- and high-wavenumber parts in the following manner. Choose $k_0 > 0$ so that $m(k) \leq \frac{1}{2}m(0)$ for $|k| \geq k_0$, let ξ be the characteristic function of the set $[-k_0, k_0]$, and write $u = u_1 + u_2$, where

$$\hat{u}_1(k) := \xi(k)\hat{u}(k), \qquad \hat{u}_2(k) := (1-\xi(k))\hat{u}(k).$$

We proceed by writing (26) as coupled equations for the low- and high-wavenumber parts of u, namely

$$(\nu - m)\hat{u}_1 = \xi\mathcal{F}[n(u) + \mathcal{E}'(u) + \nu\mathcal{Q}'(u)], \tag{28}$$

$$(\nu - m)\hat{u}_2 = (1-\xi)\mathcal{F}[n(u) + \mathcal{E}'(u) + \nu\mathcal{Q}'(u)], \tag{29}$$

and estimating u_1 using the weighted norm

$$|\!|\!| v |\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu} := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(v^2 + \mu^{-4j_\star\tau\beta}(v^{(2j_\star)})^2\right) \mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad \tau < 1 \tag{30}$$

for $H^{2j_\star}(\mathbb{R})$, which is useful in estimating the $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$-norm of u_1 and its derivatives.

Proposition 4.3 *The estimate*

$$\|v^{(j)}\|_\infty \leq c\mu^{(j+\frac{1}{2})\tau\beta}|\!|\!| v |\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}, \qquad j = 0, \ldots, 2j_\star - 1$$

holds for all $v \in H^{2j_\star}(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. Observe that

$$\|v^{(j)}\|_\infty^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\pi}\|k^j\hat{v}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{k^{2j}}{1+\mu^{-4j_\star\tau\beta}k^{4j_\star}}\,\mathrm{d}k\right)|\!|\!| v |\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}^2 \leq c\mu^{(2j+1)\tau\beta}|\!|\!| v |\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}^2. \quad \square$$

Theorem 4.4 (Scaling) *Choose* $\tau < 1$. *The estimates*

$$|\!|\!| u_1 |\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}^2 \leq c_\tau\mu \qquad \|u_2\|_1^2 \leq c_\tau\mu^{\tau\beta(p-1)+p}$$

hold for all $u \in U_\mu$ *which satisfy (27).*

Proof Note that $\nu - m(k) \geq \frac{1}{4}m(0)$ for $|k| \geq k_0$ (since $\nu > \frac{3}{4}m(0)$), so that

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}[(\nu - m)^{-1}(1-\xi)\mathcal{F}(\cdot)] \in B(H^1(\mathbb{R}), H^1(\mathbb{R})),$$

where the operator norm is bounded uniformly over $\nu > \frac{3}{4}m(0)$, and it follows from equation (29) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_2\|_1 &\leq c(\|n(u)\|_1 + \|\mathcal{E}'(u) + \nu\mathcal{Q}'(u)\|_1)\\ &\leq c(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}\|u_1\|_\infty^{p-1} + \mu^{\frac{1}{2}(p-1)}\|u_2\|_1 + \mu^N),\end{aligned}$$

where we have estimated

$$\begin{aligned}\|n(u)\|_1^2 &= \|n(u)\|_0^2 + \|n'(u)u'\|_0^2\\ &\leq c\|u\|_\infty^{2p-2}\|u\|_1^2\\ &\leq c(\|u_1\|_\infty^{2p-2}\|u_1\|_1^2 + \|u_2\|_\infty^{2p-2}\|u_1\|_1^2 + \|u\|_\infty^{2p-2}\|u_2\|_1^2)\\ &\leq c(\|u_1\|_\infty^{2p-2}\|u\|_1^2 + \|u_2\|_1^{2p-2}\|u_1\|_1^2 + \|u\|_1^{2p-2}\|u_2\|_1^2)\\ &\leq c(\|u_1\|_\infty^{2p-2}\|u\|_1^2 + \|u\|_1^{2p-2}\|u_2\|_1^2)\\ &\leq c(\mu\|u_1\|_\infty^{2p-2} + \mu^{p-1}\|u_2\|_1^2).\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$\|u_2\|_1 \leq c(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}\|u_1\|_\infty^{p-1} + \mu^N). \tag{31}$$

Turning to equation (28), observe that

$$\nu - m(k) > (\nu - m(0)) - \frac{cm^{(2j_\star)}(0)}{(2j_\star)!}k^{2j_\star} > -\frac{cm^{(2j_\star)}(0)}{(2j_\star)!}k^{2j_\star} + \mathcal{O}(\|u\|_\infty^{p+\delta-1})$$

for $|k| < k_0$ and uniformly over $u \in U_\mu$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u_1^{(2j_\star)}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\qquad \le c \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\nu - m(k))^2 |\hat{u}_1(k)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}k + c\|u_1\|_1^2 \|u\|_\infty^{2(p-1)} \\
&\qquad \le c(\|n(u)\|_0^2 + \|\mathcal{E}'(u) + \nu\mathcal{Q}'(u)\|_0^2 + \|u_1\|_1^2\|u_1\|_\infty^{2(p-1)} + \|u_1\|_1^2\|u_2\|_1^{2(p-1)}) \\
&\qquad \le c(\|n(u)\|_0^2 + \|\mathcal{E}'(u) + \nu\mathcal{Q}'(u)\|_0^2 + \|u\|_1^2\|u_1\|_\infty^{2(p-1)} + \|u\|_1^{2(p-1)}\|u_2\|_1^2) \\
&\qquad \le c(\|n(u)\|_0^2 + \|\mathcal{E}'(u) + \nu\mathcal{Q}'(u)\|_0^2 + \mu\|u_1\|_\infty^{2(p-1)} + \|u_2\|_1^2) \\
&\qquad \le c(\mu\|u_1\|_\infty^{2(p-1)} + \|u_2\|_1^2 + \mu^{2N}) \\
&\qquad \le c(\mu\|u_1\|_\infty^{2(p-1)} + \mu^{2N}) \\
&\qquad \le c(\mu^{1+(p-1)\tau\beta}|\!|\!|u_1|\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}^{2(p-1)} + \mu^{2N}) \\
&\qquad \le c\left(\mu^{1+(p-1)(\tau\beta+1)}\left(\frac{|\!|\!|u_1|\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}}{\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)^{2(p-1)} + \mu^{2N}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have estimated

$$\|n(u)\|_0^2 \le c(\|u_1\|_\infty^{2p-2}\|u_1\|_0^2 + \|u_2\|_1^{2p}) \le c(\mu\|u_1\|_\infty^{2p-2} + \|u_2\|_1^2)$$

and used (31) and Proposition 4.3. Multiplying this estimate by $\mu^{-4j_\star\tau\beta}$ and adding the inequality $\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_1^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \le 2\mu$, one finds that

$$|\!|\!|u_1|\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}^2 \le c\mu\left(1 + \mu^{(1-\tau)(p-1)}\left(\frac{|\!|\!|u_1|\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}^2}{\mu}\right)^{p-1}\right).$$

Define $Q = \{\tau \in (-\infty, 1) : |\!|\!|u_1|\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}^2 \le c_\tau\mu\}$. The inequality $|\!|\!|u_1|\!|\!|_{\tau_1,\mu}^2 \le |\!|\!|u_1|\!|\!|_{\tau_2,\mu}^2$ for $\tau_1 \le \tau_2$ shows that $(-\infty, \tau] \subset Q$ whenever $\tau \in Q$; furthermore $(-\infty, 0] \subseteq Q$ because $|\!|\!|u_1|\!|\!|_{0,\mu}^2 \le \|u_1\|_0^2 \le 2\mu$. Suppose that $\tau_\star := \sup Q$ is strictly less than unity, choose $\varepsilon > 0$ so that $\tau_\star + (1 + 8j_\star\beta)\varepsilon < 1$ and observe that

$$\frac{|\!|\!|u_1|\!|\!|_{\tau_\star+\varepsilon,\mu}^2}{\mu} \;\le\; c\left(1 + \mu^{(1-\tau_\star-(1+8j_\star\beta)\varepsilon)(p-1)}\underbrace{\left(\frac{|\!|\!|u_1|\!|\!|_{\tau_\star-\varepsilon,\mu}^2}{\mu}\right)^{p-1}}_{\le c_{\tau^\star-\varepsilon}}\right),$$

which leads to the contradiction that $\tau_\star + \varepsilon \in Q$. It follows that $\tau_\star = 1$ and $|\!|\!|u_1|\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}^2 \le c_\tau\mu$ for each $\tau < 1$.

The bound for $\|u_2\|_1^2$ follows from inequality (31), Proposition 4.3 and the bound for $|\!|\!|u_1|\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}^2$. □

Corollary 4.5 *Choose $\tau < 1$. The estimate*

$$\|u\|_\infty \le c_\tau\mu^\alpha\mu^{(1-\tau)(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha)}$$

holds for all $u \in U_\mu$ which satisfy (27).

Proof Using Proposition 4.3, Theorem 4.4 and the relation $\beta = 2\alpha - 1$, one finds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_\infty &\leq \|u_1\|_\infty + \|u_2\|_\infty \\
&\leq c(\mu^{\frac{\tau\beta}{2}} |\!|\!| u_1 |\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu} + \|u_2\|_1) \\
&\leq c_\tau(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\tau\beta}{2}} + \mu^{\frac{p}{2}+\frac{\tau\beta}{2}(p-1)}) \\
&\leq c_\tau \mu^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\tau\beta}{2}} \\
&= c_\tau \mu^\alpha \mu^{(1-\tau)(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 4.6 *Any function $u \in U_\mu$ satisfying (25) has the property that*

$$\nu - m(0) > 0.$$

Proof Using Corollary 4.5, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_\infty^{p+\delta-1} &\leq c\|u\|_1^\delta \|u\|_\infty^{p-1} \\
&\leq c_\tau \mu^{\frac{\delta}{2}} \mu^{(p-1)\alpha} \mu^{(1-\tau)(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha)(p-1)} \\
&= c_\tau \mu^{\frac{\delta}{2}+(1-\tau)(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha)(p-1)} \mu^{(p-1)\alpha} \\
&= o(\mu^{(p-1)\alpha})
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly over $u \in D_\mu$ for τ sufficiently close to 1, whereby Proposition 4.1 shows that

$$\nu - m(0) > \tfrac{1}{2} I_\star (p+1) \mu^{(p-1)\alpha} + o(\mu^{(p-1)\alpha}) > 0.$$ □

Strict subhomogeneity

A function $\mu \mapsto I_\mu$ is said to be *strictly subhomogeneous* on an interval $(0, \mu_\star)$ if

$$I_{a\mu} < aI_\mu \quad \text{whenever} \quad 0 < \mu < a\mu < \mu_\star;$$

a straightforward argument shows that strict subhomogeneity implies strict subadditivity on the same interval (see Buffoni [5, p. 48]).

Proposition 4.7

(i) Any function $u \in U_\mu$ with the property

$$\mathcal{E}(u) < -\mu m(0) - I_\star \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha} \tag{32}$$

satisfies

$$\mathcal{N}(u) \leq -c\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}.$$

This result holds in particular for any minimising sequence $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ for $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ.

(ii) Any function $u \in U_\mu$ with the property (32) satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{p+1}(u)\,\mathrm{d}x \geq c\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}.$$

This result holds in particular for the sequence $\{\tilde{u}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$.

Proof The first result is a consequence of the equation

$$\mathcal{N}(u) = \mathcal{E}(u) - \mathcal{L}(u)$$

and the estimates (32) and

$$-\mathcal{L}(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} uLu \,\mathrm{d}x \le \frac{m(0)}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 \,\mathrm{d}x = \mu m(0),$$

while the second is obtained from the first using the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{\mathrm{r}}(u)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| &\le c\|u\|_1^{2+\delta}\|u\|_\infty^{p-1} \\
&\le c_\tau \mu^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} \mu^{(p-1)\alpha} \mu^{(1-\tau)(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha)(p-1)} \\
&= c_\tau \mu^{\frac{\delta}{2}+(1-\tau)(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha)(p-1)} \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha} \\
&= o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}) \qquad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

for τ sufficiently close to 1 (see Corollary 4.5). □

Lemma 4.8 *The map $\mu \mapsto I_\mu$ is strictly subhomogeneous for $\mu \in (0, \mu_\star)$.*

Proof Fix $a > 1$ and note that $\|a^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{u}_n\|_1^2 \le ca\mu < R$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{a\mu} &\le \mathcal{E}(a^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{u}_n) \\
&= \mathcal{L}(a^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{u}_n) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{p+1}(a^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{u}_n)\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{\mathrm{r}}(a\tilde{u}_n)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= a\mathcal{L}(\tilde{u}_n) - a^{\frac{1}{2}(p+1)}\int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{p+1}(\tilde{u}_n)\,\mathrm{d}x + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}) \\
&= a\mathcal{E}(\tilde{u}_n) - (a^{\frac{1}{2}(p+1)} - a)\int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{p+1}(\tilde{u}_n)\,\mathrm{d}x + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}) \\
&\le a\mathcal{E}(\tilde{u}_n) - c(a^{\frac{1}{2}(p+1)} - a)\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha} + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}), \qquad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

in which we have used Proposition 4.7(ii) and the estimate

$$\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{\mathrm{r}}(a\tilde{u}_n)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \le ca^{p+\delta+1}\|\tilde{u}_n\|_1^{2+\delta}\|\tilde{u}_n\|_\infty^{p-1} = o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha})$$

(cf. calculation (33)). In the limit $n \to \infty$ inequality (34) yields

$$I_{a\mu} \le aI_\mu - c(a^{\frac{1}{2}(p+1)} - a)\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha} + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}),$$

from which it follows that $I_{a\mu} < aI_\mu$. □

5. Concentration-compactness

In this section we present the proof of Theorem 1.2 with the help of the concentration-compactness principle (Lions [14]), which we now recall in a form suitable for our purposes.

Theorem 5.1 (Concentration-compactness) *Any sequence* $\{e_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \subset L^1(\mathbb{R})$ *of non-negative functions with the property that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e_n \,\mathrm{d}x = l > 0$$

admits a subsequence, denoted again by $\{e_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$*, for which one of the following phenomena occurs.*

Vanishing: For each $r > 0$ *one has that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\sup_{x_0\in\mathbb{R}}\int_{B_r(x_0)} e_n \,\mathrm{d}x\right) = 0. \tag{35}$$

Concentration: There is a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \subset \mathbb{R}$ *with the property that for each* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there exists* $r > 0$ *with*

$$\int_{B_r(x_n)} e_n \,\mathrm{d}x \geq l - \varepsilon, \tag{36}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Dichotomy: There are sequences $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$, $\{M_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$, $\{N_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \subset \mathbb{R}$ *and a real number* $\lambda \in (0, l)$ *with the properties that* $M_n, N_n \to \infty$, $M_n/N_n \to 0$,

$$\int_{B_{M_n}(x_n)} e_n \,\mathrm{d}x \to \lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{B_{N_n}(x_n)} e_n \,\mathrm{d}x \to \lambda \tag{37}$$

as $n \to \infty$.

We proceed by applying Theorem 5.1 to the functions $e_n = u_n^2$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, where $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is a minimising sequence for $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ with the property that $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}\|u_n\|_1 < R$, so that $\ell = 2\mu$.

It is a straightforward matter to exclude 'vanishing'.

Lemma 5.2 *No subsequence of* $\{e_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *has the 'vanishing' property.*

Proof Suppose that $\{e_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ satisfies (35), and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{N}(u_n)| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |N(u_n)| \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\leq c\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \int_{2j-1}^{2j+1} |u_n|^{p+1} \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\leq c\|u\|_\infty^{p-1} \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \int_{2j-1}^{2j+1} |u_n|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\leq c\|u\|_1^{p-1}\left(\sup_{x_0\in\mathbb{R}}\int_{B_1(x_0)} e_n \,\mathrm{d}x\right) \\
&\leq c\sup_{x_0\in\mathbb{R}}\int_{B_1(x_0)} e_n \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\to 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$, which contradicts Proposition 4.7(i). □

Lemma 5.3 *Choose $s \in (0,1)$ and suppose that a subsequence of $\{e_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ 'concentrates'. There exists a subsequence of $\{u_n(\cdot + x_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ which converges in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ to a minimiser of $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ.*

Proof Write $v_n := u_n(\cdot + x_n)$, so that $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \|v_n\|_1 < R$. Equation (36) implies that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $r > 0$ such that

$$\|v_n\|_{L^2(|x|>r)} < \varepsilon.$$

On the other hand $\{v_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ converges weakly in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ and strongly in $L^2(-r,r)$ to a function v with $\|v\|_1 < R$; it follows that $v_n \to v$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ as $n \to \infty$. In view of the interpolation inequality $\|v_n - v\|_s \leq \|v_n - v\|_0^{1-s}\|v_n - v\|_1^s$ we conclude that $v_n \to v$ in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ as $n \to \infty$, so that $\mathcal{E}(v_n) \to \mathcal{E}(v)$ as $n \to \infty$ (Proposition 2.2(ii)) with $\mathcal{E}(v) = I_\mu$ (by uniqueness of limits). □

Suppose now that 'dichotomy' occurs, and that $\{e_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ satisfies (37); note in particular that the sequence $\{v_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ with $v_n = u_n(\cdot + x_n)$ satisfies

$$\|v_n\|^2_{L^2(M_n<|x|<N_n)} = \int_{-N_n}^{N_n} e_n \,\mathrm{d}x - \int_{-M_n}^{M_n} e_n \,\mathrm{d}x \to 0 \tag{38}$$

as $n \to \infty$. Let ζ be a smooth, decreasing 'cut-off' function with

$$\zeta(r) := \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \leq r \leq 1, \\ 0, & r \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

and define

$$v_n^{(1)}(x) := v_n(x)\zeta\left(\frac{|x|}{M_n}\right),$$
$$v_n^{(2)}(x) := v_n(x)\left(1 - \zeta\left(\frac{2|x|}{N_n}\right)\right),$$

so that

$$\operatorname{supp}(v_n^{(1)}) \subseteq [-2M_n, 2M_n], \qquad \operatorname{supp}(v_n^{(2)}) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \setminus (-\tfrac{N_n}{2}, \tfrac{N_n}{2}),$$

which in view of the properties of M_n and N_n are disjoint sets for large values of n.

Proposition 5.4 *The sequences $\{v_n^{(1)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ and $\{v_n^{(2)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ satisfy $\|v_n^{(1)}\|_0^2 \to \lambda$, $\|v_n^{(2)}\|_0^2 \to 2\mu - \lambda$ and*

$$\|v_n^{(j)}\|^2_{L^2(M_n<|x|<N_n)} \to 0, \qquad j = 1, 2. \tag{39}$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Proof The limits (39) are a direct consequence of (38) since $|v_n^{(1)}|$, $|v_n^{(2)}| \leq |v_n|$. It follows that

$$\|v_n^{(1)}\|^2_{L^2(M_n<|x|<2M_n)} \leq \|v_n^{(1)}\|^2_{L^2(M_n<|x|<N_n)} \to 0$$

and

$$\|v_n^{(1)}\|^2_{L^2(\frac{N_n}{2}<|x|<N_n)} \leq \|v_n^{(1)}\|^2_{L^2(M_n<|x|<N_n)} \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$. Using these results, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_n^{(1)}\|_0^2 &= \|v_n^{(1)}\|^2_{L^2(|x|<M_n)} + \|v_n^{(1)}\|^2_{L^2(M_n<|x|<2M_n)} \\ &= \int_{-M_n}^{M_n} v_n \,\mathrm{d}x + \|v_n^{(1)}\|^2_{L^2(M_n<|x|<2M_n)} \\ &\to \lambda \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|v_n^{(2)}\|_0^2 &= \|v_n^{(2)}\|^2_{L^2(|x|>N_n)} + \|v_n^{(2)}\|^2_{L^2(\frac{N_n}{2}<|x|<N_n)}\\ &= \underbrace{\|v_n\|_2^2}_{=2\mu} - \int_{-N_n}^{N_n} v_n \,\mathrm{d}x + \|v_n^{(2)}\|^2_{L^2(\frac{N_n}{2}<|x|<N_n)}\\ &\to 2\mu - \lambda\end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$. □

Define

$$u_n^{(1)} := \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\|v_n^{(1)}\|_0}\, v_n^{(1)}, \qquad u_n^{(2)} := \frac{\sqrt{2\mu-\lambda}}{\|v_n^{(2)}\|_0}\, v_n^{(2)},$$

so that

$$\|u_n^{(1)}\|_0^2 = \lambda, \qquad \|u_n^{(2)}\|_0^2 = 2\mu - \lambda, \tag{40}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. According to the next proposition we can assume without loss of generality that $\{u_n^{(1)}\} \subset U_{\frac{\lambda}{2}}$ and $\{u_n^{(2)}\} \subset U_{\mu-\frac{\lambda}{2}}$.

Proposition 5.5 *The sequences* $\{u_n^{(1)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *and* $\{u_n^{(2)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *satisfy*

(i) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|v_n - u_n^{(1)} - u_n^{(2)}\|_0^2 = 0,$

(ii) $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|u_n^{(1)} + u_n^{(2)}\|_1 < R$ *and* $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|u_n^{(j)}\|_1 < R$, $j = 1, 2$.

Proof (i) Clearly

$$\|v_n - v_n^{(1)} - v_n^{(2)}\|_0^2 = \|v_n - v_n^{(1)} - v_n^{(2)}\|^2_{L^2(M_n<|x|<N_n)} \to 0 \tag{41}$$

as $n \to \infty$ in view of the triangle inequality and the limits (38) and (39). On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_n^{(1)} + u_n^{(2)} - v_n^{(1)} - v_n^{(2)}\|_0^2 &= \|u_n^{(1)} - v_n^{(1)}\|_0^2 + \|u_n^{(2)} - v_n^{(2)}\|_0^2\\ &= \left(\frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\|v_n^{(1)}\|_0} - 1\right)^2 \|v_n^{(1)}\|_0^2 + \left(\frac{\sqrt{2\mu-\lambda}}{\|v_n^{(2)}\|_0} - 1\right)^2 \|v_n^{(2)}\|_0^2\\ &\to 0 \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

as $n \to \infty$ (Proposition 5.4).

(ii) Note that $\|v_n'\|_0^2 \le R$ and

$$\left|\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}\left(\zeta\left(\frac{|x|}{M_n}\right) + 1 - \zeta\left(\frac{2|x|}{N_n}\right)\right)\right| \le cM_n^{-1},$$

uniformly over $x \in \mathbb{R}$, whence

$$\|(v_n^{(1)} + v_n^{(2)})'\|_0^2 \le \|v_n'\|_0^2 + \mathcal{O}(M_n^{-1}),$$

and (41) shows that

$$\|v_n^{(1)} + v_n^{(2)}\|_0^2 = \|v_n\|_0^2 + o(1)$$

as $n \to \infty$. Combining these estimates, one finds that

$$\|v_n^{(1)} + v_n^{(2)}\|_1^2 \leq \|v_n\|_1^2 + o(1),$$

which in the light of (42) implies that

$$\|u_n^{(1)} + u_n^{(2)}\|_1^2 \leq \|v_n\|_1^2 + o(1)$$

as $n \to \infty$.

The previous inequality shows that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|u_n^{(1)} + u_n^{(2)}\|_1 \leq \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \|v_n\|_1 < R,$$

and the results for $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|u_n^{(2)}\|_1$, $j = 1, 2$ follow from the estimates

$$\|u_n^{(j)}\|_1 \leq \|u_n^{(1)} + u_n^{(2)}\|_1, \qquad j = 1, 2. \qquad \square$$

Our next result shows that $\{\mathcal{E}(v_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ decomposes into two parts for large values of n.

Proposition 5.6 *The sequences* $\{u_n^{(1)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *and* $\{u_n^{(2)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *satisfy*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \big(\mathcal{E}(v_n) - \mathcal{E}(u_n^{(1)}) - \mathcal{E}(u_n^{(2)})\big) = 0.$$

Proof First note that

$$|\mathcal{E}(v_n) - \mathcal{E}(u_n^{(1)} + u_n^{(2)})| \leq \sup_{u\in U} \|\mathcal{E}'(u)\|_0 \|v_n - u_n^{(1)} - u_n^{(2)}\|_0 \to 0 \tag{43}$$

as $n \to \infty$ since $\|\mathcal{E}'(u)\|_0$ is bounded on U.

Furthermore

$$\mathcal{L}(u_n^{(1)} + u_n^{(2)}) = \mathcal{L}(u_n^{(1)}) + \mathcal{L}(u_n^{(2)}) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_n^{(2)} L u_n^{(1)} \,\mathrm{d}x,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_n^{(2)} L u_n^{(1)} \,\mathrm{d}x\right| &\leq \tilde{C}_1 \|u_n^{(1)}\|_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|u_n^{(2)}(x)|}{\operatorname{dist}(x, \operatorname{supp}(u_n^{(1)}))} \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\leq \tilde{C}_1 R \int_{|x|>\frac{N_n}{2}} \frac{|u_n^{(2)}(x)|}{\operatorname{dist}(x, [-2M_n, 2M_n])} \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\leq \tilde{C}_1 R^2 \left(2\int_{N_n/2}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{(x-2M_n)^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \tilde{C}_1 R^2 \left(\frac{4}{N_n\left(1 - \frac{4M_n}{N_n}\right)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\to 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$, so that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \big(\mathcal{L}(u_n^{(1)} + u_n^{(2)}) - \mathcal{L}(u_n^{(1)}) - \mathcal{L}(u_n^{(2)})\big) = 0.$$

Combining this result with the equation

$$\mathcal{N}(u_n^{(1)}+u_n^{(2)})=\mathcal{N}(u_n^{(1)})+\mathcal{N}(u_n^{(2)})$$

(the supports of $u_n^{(1)}$ and $u_n^{(2)}$ are disjoint), one finds that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\big(\mathcal{E}(u_n^{(1)}+u_n^{(2)})-\mathcal{E}(u_n^{(1)})-\mathcal{E}(u_n^{(2)})\big)=0. \tag{44}$$

The stated result follows from (43) and (44). □

Lemma 5.7 *No subsequence of* $\{v_n\}_{n\in N}$ *has the 'dichotomy' property.*

Proof Recall that $\{v_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is a minimising sequence for $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ and that $\mathcal{E}(u_n^{(1)})\geq I_{\frac{\lambda}{2}}$, $\mathcal{E}(u_n^{(2)})\geq I_{\mu-\frac{\lambda}{2}}$. Using Lemma 5.6 and the strict-subadditivity of $\mu\mapsto I_\mu$ on $(0,\mu^\star)$, we arrive at the contradiction

$$\begin{aligned} I_\mu &< I_{\mu_1}+I_{\mu_2}\\ &\leq \lim_{n\to\infty}\Big(\mathcal{E}(u_n^{(1)})+\mathcal{E}(u_n^{(2)})\Big)\\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\mathcal{E}(v_n)\\ &= I_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

□

According to Theorem 5.1 and Lemmata 5.2 and 5.7 a subsequence of $\{e_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ concentrates, so that the hypotheses of Lemma 5.3 are satisfied. It follows that D_μ is nonempty and Theorem 1.2(ii) holds. The remaining assertions in Theorem 1.2(i) are proved by applying Proposition 4.1 and Corollary 4.6 to $u\in D_\mu$.

6. Consequences of the existence theory

An a priori result for supercritical solitary waves

We now record an *a priori* estimate for supercritical solutions $u\in U_\mu$ of (3). The result states that such solutions are long waves which 'scale' in a fashion similar to the *Ansatz* (8). More precisely, we show that $|\!|\!|u|\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}^2\leq c_\tau\mu$ for $\tau<1$, where $|\!|\!|\cdot|\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}$ is the weighted norm for $H^{2j_\star}(\mathbb{R})$ defined by formula (30), so that $\|u^{(j)}\|_0\leq c_\tau\mu^{\frac{1}{2}+j\tau\beta}$ for $j=1,\ldots,2j_\star$. We make the following additional assumption on the nonlinearity n, which ensures that $u\in H^{2j_\star}(\mathbb{R})$ with $\|u\|_{2j_\star}=O(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}})$ (see Lemma 2.3).

(A4) The nonlinearity n *belongs to* $C^{2j_\star}(\mathbb{R})$ *with*

$$n_{\mathrm{r}}^{(j)}(x)=\mathcal{O}(|x|^{p+\delta-j}),\qquad j=0,\ldots,2j_\star$$

for some $\delta>0$ *as* $x\to0$.

Lemma 6.1 *Suppose that the additional regularity assumption (A4) holds. Every supercritical solution* $u\in U_\mu$ *of (3) satisfies* $|\!|\!|u|\!|\!|_{\tau,\mu}^2\leq c_\tau\mu$ *for all* $\tau<1$.

Proof Write (3) as

$$(\nu-m)\hat{u}_1=\xi\mathcal{F}[n(u)],\qquad \hat{u}_2=(\nu-m)^{-1}(1-\xi)\mathcal{F}[n(u)].$$

Observing that

$$\nu - m(k) > (\nu - m(0)) - \frac{cm^{(2j_\star)}(0)}{(2j_\star)!}k^{2j_\star} > -\frac{cm^{(2j_\star)}(0)}{(2j_\star)!}k^{2j_\star}$$

for $|k| < k_0$, we find that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u_1^{(2j_\star)}|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x \le c\int_{\mathbb{R}} (\nu - m(k))^2 |\hat{u}_1(k)|^2 \, \mathrm{d}k \le c\|n(u)\|_0^2 \le c\|u\|_\infty^{2(p-1)}\|u\|_0^2.$$

On the other hand

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}[(\nu - m)^{-1}(1-\xi)\mathcal{F}(\cdot)] \in B(L^2(\mathbb{R}), L^2(\mathbb{R})),$$

where the operator norm is bounded uniformly over $\nu > m(0)$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|u_2^{(2j_\star)}\|_0 \\
&\quad \le c\|(n(u))^{(2j_\star)}\|_0 \\
&\quad \le c\sum_{i=1}^{2j_\star} \|n^{(i)}(u) B_{2j_\star,i}(u', \ldots, u^{(2j_\star - i+1)})\|_0 \\
&\quad \le c\sum_{i=1}^{2j_\star} \|u\|_\infty^{p-i} \sum_{J_i} \|(u')^{j_1} \ldots (u^{(2j_\star-i+1)})^{j_{2j_\star-i+1}}\|_0 \\
&\quad \le c\sum_{i=1}^{2j_\star} \|u\|_\infty^{p-i} \sum_{J_i} \|u'\|_{L^{\frac{4j_\star}{1}}(\mathbb{R})}^{j_1} \ldots \|u^{(2j_\star-i+1)}\|_{L^{\frac{4j_\star}{2j_\star-i+1}}(\mathbb{R})}^{j_{2j_\star-i+1}} \\
&\quad \le c\sum_{i=1}^{2j_\star} \|u\|_\infty^{p-i} \sum_{J_i} \left(\|u\|_\infty^{1-\frac{1}{2j_\star}} \|u^{(2j_\star)}\|_0^{\frac{1}{2j_\star}}\right)^{j_1} \ldots \left(\|u\|_\infty^{1-\frac{2j_\star-i+1}{2j_\star}} \|u^{(2j_\star)}\|_0^{\frac{2j_\star-i+1}{2j_\star}}\right)^{j_{2j_\star-i+1}} \\
&\quad \le c\|u\|_\infty^{p-1}\|u^{(2j_\star)}\|_0,
\end{aligned}$$

where $B_{2j_\star,i}$ denote the Bell polynomials,

$$J_i = \{(j_1, \ldots, j_{2j_\star-i+1}) : \; j_1 + \ldots + j_{2j_\star-i+1} = i, \; j_1 + 2j_2 + \ldots + (2j_\star - i+1)j_{2j_\star-i+1} = 2j_\star\}$$

and the generalised Hölder and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities have been used (see Hardy, Littlewood & Pólya [12, Theorem 8.8] and Friedman [9, Theorem 9.3]).

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u^{(2j_\star)}|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x &\le c\|u\|_{2j_\star}^2 \|u\|_\infty^{2(p-1)} \\
&\le c\mu\|u\|_\infty^{2(p-1)} \\
&\le c(\mu^{1+(p-1)\tau\beta} |||u|||_{\tau,\mu}^{2(p-1)}) \\
&\le c\left(\mu^{1+(p-1)(\tau\beta+1)} \left(\frac{|||u|||_{\tau,\mu}}{\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)^{2(p-1)}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

and multiplying this estimate by $\mu^{-4j_\star\tau\beta}$ and adding $\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 \, \mathrm{d}x = 2\mu$ yields

$$|||u|||_{\tau,\mu}^2 \le c\mu \left(1 + \mu^{(1-\tau)(p-1)} \left(\frac{|||u|||_{\tau,\mu}^2}{\mu}\right)^{p-1}\right).$$

The stated estimate is obtained from this inequality using the argument given at the end of the proof of Theorem 4.4. □

Convergence to long waves

In this section we work under the additional regularity condition (A4) and examine the relationship between D_μ and D_{lw}, beginning with that between the quantities

$$I_\mu := \inf\{\mathcal{E}(u)\colon u \in U_\mu\}$$

and

$$I_{\mathrm{lw}} := \inf\{\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}(w) : w \in W_1\}.$$

Lemma 6.2

(i) The quantity I_μ satisfies

$$I_\mu = -m(0)\mu + \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}(u) + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha})$$

uniformly over $u \in D_\mu$.

(ii) The quantities I_μ and I_{lw} satisfy

$$I_\mu = -m(0)\mu + \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha} I_{\mathrm{lw}} + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}).$$

Proof (i) Using the identity

$$\mathcal{E}(u) = -m(0)\mu + \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}(u) - \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} r(k)|\hat{u}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}k - \int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{\mathrm{r}}(u)\,\mathrm{d}x$$

for $u \in U_\mu \cap H^{j_\star}(\mathbb{R})$, we find that

$$I_\mu = \mathcal{E}(u) = -m(0)\mu + \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}(u) - \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} r(k)|\hat{u}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}k - \int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{\mathrm{r}}(u)\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

for each $u \in D_\mu$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} r(k)|\hat{u}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}k + \int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{\mathrm{r}}(u)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \\
&\qquad \leq c\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} k^{2j_\star+2}|\hat{u}|^2\,\mathrm{d}k + \|u\|_1^2\|u\|_\infty^{p+\delta-1}\right) \\
&\qquad \leq c_\tau(\mu^{2(j_\star+1)\tau\beta}|||u|||_{\tau,\mu}^2 + \mu^{1+\frac{1}{2}(p+\delta-1)\tau\beta}|||u|||_{\tau,\mu}^{p+\delta-1}) \\
&\qquad \leq c_\tau(\mu^{1+2(j_\star+1)\tau\beta} + \mu^{1+\frac{1}{2}(p+\delta-1)(\tau\beta+1)}) \\
&\qquad = o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha})
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly over $u \in D_\mu$.

(ii) Choosing $u \in D_\mu$ and applying (i), one finds that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_\mu &= -m(0)\mu + \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}(u) + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}) \\
&= -m(0)\mu + \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}(S_{\mathrm{lw}}^{-1}u) + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}) \\
&\geq -m(0)\mu + \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha} I_{\mathrm{lw}} + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, choosing $w \in D_{\mathrm{lw}}$ and applying Lemma 3.2, one finds that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_\mu &\leq \mathcal{E}(S_{\mathrm{lw}}w) \\
&= -m(0)\mu + \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}(w) + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}) \\
&= -m(0)\mu + \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha} I_{\mathrm{lw}} + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Our main result shows how a scaling of D_μ converges to D_{lw} as $\mu \searrow 0$.

Theorem 6.3 *The sets* D_μ *and* $D_{\rm lw}$ *satisfy*

$$\sup_{u \in D_\mu} \operatorname{dist}_{H^{j_\star}(\mathbb{R})}\big(S_{\rm lw}^{-1}u, D_{\rm lw}\big) \to 0$$

as $\mu \searrow 0$.

Proof Assume that the result is false. There exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and sequences $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \subset (0,\mu_\star)$, $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \subset H^{2j_\star}(\mathbb{R})$ with $u_n \in D_{\mu_n}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mu_n = 0$ and

$$\inf_{w\in D_{\rm lw}} \|w_n - w\|_{j_\star} \geq \varepsilon, \tag{46}$$

where $w_n(x) := \mu_n^{-\alpha} u_n(\mu_n^{-\beta}x)$. Using Lemma 6.2(i), one finds that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\mu_n} &= -m(0)\mu_n + \mathcal{E}_{\rm lw}(u_n) + o(\mu_n^{1+(p-1)\alpha}) \\ &= -m(0)\mu_n + \mu_n^{1+(p-1)\alpha}\mathcal{E}_{\rm lw}(w_n) + o(\mu_n^{1+(p-1)\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$, and because

$$I_{\mu_n} = -m(0)\mu_n + \mu_n^{1+(p-1)\alpha} I_{\rm lw} + o(\mu_n^{1+(p-1)\alpha})$$

(Lemma 6.2(ii)), it follows that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\rm lw}(w_n) = I_{\rm lw} + o(1)$$

as $n \to \infty$, so that $\{w_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is a minimising sequence for $\mathcal{E}_{\rm lw}$ over $\{w \in H^{j_\star}(\mathbb{R}) : \mathcal{Q}(w) = 1\}$. According to Theorem 1.1 there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ of real numbers with the property that a subsequence of $\{w_n(\cdot + x_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ converges in $H^{j_\star}(\mathbb{R})$ to an element of $D_{\rm lw}$. This fact contradicts (46). □

Remark 6.4 *The previous theorem implies that* $\{S_{\rm lw}^{-1}u\}_{u\in D_\mu}$ *is a bounded set in* $H^{j_\star}(\mathbb{R})$. *For all* $u \in D_\mu$ *we therefore find that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_\infty^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi}\|\hat{u}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1+\mu^{-2j_\star\beta}k^{2j_\star}}\,\mathrm{d}k\right)\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} (1+\mu^{-2j_\star\beta}k^{2j_\star})|\hat{u}|^2\,\mathrm{d}k\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\mu^{2\alpha}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1+k^{2j_\star}}\,\mathrm{d}k\right)\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} (1+k^{2j_\star})|\mathcal{F}[S_{\rm lw}^{-1}u]|^2\,\mathrm{d}k\right) \\ &\leq c\mu^{2\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

and inequality (45) implies that

$$\mu^{-4j_*\beta}\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u^{(2j_\star)}|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \leq c\mu^{1+2\alpha(p-1)-4j_*\beta} = c\mu,$$

whence $|\!|\!|u|\!|\!|_{1,\mu}^2 \leq c\mu$. *For* $u \in D_\mu$ *Lemma 6.1 therefore also holds with* $\tau = 1$ *(the result predicted by the long-wave Ansatz (8)), and in particular* $\{S_{\rm lw}^{-1}u\}_{u\in D_\mu}$ *lies in* W *for sufficiently large values of* S.

Finally, we relate the wave speeds $\nu(u)$ and $\nu_{\rm lw}(w)$ associated with respectively $u \in D_\mu$ and $w \in D_{\rm lw}$.

Lemma 6.5 *There exists a family* $\{w_u\}_{u \in D_\mu}$ *of functions in* D_{lw} *such that*

$$\nu(u) = m(0) + \mu^{(p-1)\alpha}\nu_{\mathrm{lw}}(w_u) + o(\mu^{(p-1)\alpha})$$

uniformly over $u \in D_\mu$.

Proof Using the identity

$$\langle \mathcal{E}'(u), u\rangle_0 = -2m(0)\mathcal{Q}(u) + \langle \mathcal{E}'_{\mathrm{lw}}(u), u\rangle_0 - \int_{\mathbb{R}} r(k)|\hat{u}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}k - \int_{\mathbb{R}} u\, n_{\mathrm{r}}(u)\,\mathrm{d}x$$

for $u \in U$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{E}'(u), u\rangle_0 = &-2m(0)\mu + \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}\langle \mathcal{E}'_{\mathrm{lw}}(S_{\mathrm{lw}}^{-1}u), S_{\mathrm{lw}}^{-1}u\rangle_0 \\ &- \mu^{2\alpha-\beta}\int_{\mathbb{R}} r(\mu^\beta k)|\mathcal{F}[S_{\mathrm{lw}}^{-1}u]|^2\,\mathrm{d}k - \mu^{\alpha-\beta}\int_{\mathbb{R}} S_{\mathrm{lw}}^{-1}u\, n_{\mathrm{r}}(\mu^\alpha S_{\mathrm{lw}}^{-1}u)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ = &-2m(0)\mu + \mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}\langle \mathcal{E}'_{\mathrm{lw}}(S_{\mathrm{lw}}^{-1}u), S_{\mathrm{lw}}^{-1}u\rangle_0 + o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha}) \qquad (47)\end{aligned}$$

uniformly over $u \in D_\mu$, where the second line follows from the observation that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\mu^{2\alpha-\beta}\int_{\mathbb{R}} r(\mu^\beta k)|\hat{w}|^2\,\mathrm{d}k + \mu^{\alpha-\beta}\int_{\mathbb{R}} w\, n_{\mathrm{r}}(\mu^\alpha w)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \\ &\qquad \le c\left(\mu^{2\alpha+(2j_\star+1)\beta}\int_{\mathbb{R}} k^{2j_\star+2}|\hat{w}|^2\,\mathrm{d}k + \mu^{(p+\delta+1)\alpha-\beta}\int_{\mathbb{R}} |w|^{p+\delta+1}\,\mathrm{d}x\right) \\ &\qquad = o(\mu^{1+(p-1)\alpha})\end{aligned}$$

uniformly over $w \in W$.

Theorem 6.3 asserts in particular the existence of $w_u \in D_{\mathrm{lw}}$ such that

$$\|S_{\mathrm{lw}}^{-1}u - w_u\|_{j_\star} = o(1)$$

and therefore

$$\langle \mathcal{E}'_{\mathrm{lw}}(S_{\mathrm{lw}}^{-1}u), S_{\mathrm{lw}}^{-1}u\rangle_0 - \langle \mathcal{E}'_{\mathrm{lw}}(w_u), w_u\rangle_0 = \sup_{w\in W}\|\mathcal{G}'(w)\|_0 \|S_{\mathrm{lw}}^{-1}u - w_u\|_0 = o(1) \qquad (48)$$

uniformly over $u \in D_\mu$, where

$$\mathcal{G}(w) = \langle \mathcal{E}'_{\mathrm{lw}}(w), w\rangle_0 = -\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left\{\frac{m^{(2j_\star)}(0)}{(2j_\star)!}(w^{(j_\star)})^2 + (p+1)N_{p+1}(w)\right\}\mathrm{d}x.$$

Furthermore, it follows from the equations

$$\mathcal{E}'(u) + \nu(u)\mathcal{Q}'(u) = 0, \qquad \mathcal{E}'_{\mathrm{lw}}(w_u) + \nu_{\mathrm{lw}}(w_u)\mathcal{Q}'_{\mathrm{lw}}(w_u) = 0$$

that

$$2\nu(u)\mu = -\langle \mathcal{E}'(u), u\rangle_0, \qquad 2\nu_{\mathrm{lw}}(w_u) = -\langle \mathcal{E}'_{\mathrm{lw}}(w_u), w_u\rangle_0 \qquad (49)$$

for each $u \in U_\mu$. Combining (47)–(49), one finds that

$$\nu(u) = m(0) + \mu^{(p-1)\alpha}\nu_{\mathrm{lw}}(w_u) + o(\mu^{(p-1)\alpha})$$

uniformly over $u \in U_\mu$. □

Remark 6.6 *For the Whitham equation Theorem 6.3 and Lemma 6.5 yield the convergence results*

$$\sup_{u\in D_\mu}\inf_{y\in\mathbb{R}}\|\mu^{-\frac{2}{3}}u(\mu^{-\frac{1}{3}}(\cdot+y))-w_{\mathrm{Kdv}}\|_1\to 0$$

and

$$\sup_{u\in D_\mu}\left|\nu(u)-1-\mu^{\frac{2}{3}}\left(\tfrac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\right|=o(\mu^{\frac{2}{3}})$$

as $\mu\searrow 0$, which show how Whitham solitary waves are approximated by a scaling of the classical Korteweg-deVries solitary wave.

Stability

In this section we explain how Theorem 1.2(ii) implies that the set of solitary-wave solutions to (1) defined by D_μ enjoys a certain type of stability, working with the following local well-posedness assumption. (Although consideration of the initial-value problem is outside the scope of this paper we note that a local well-posedness result in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ for $s>\frac{3}{2}$ may be obtained using Kato's method [13]; see also Abdelouhab, Bona, Felland & Saut [1].)

Well-posedness assumption *There exists a subset $M\subset U$ with the following properties.*

(i) The closure of $M\setminus D_\mu$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ has a non-empty intersection with D_μ.

(ii) For each initial datum $u_0\in M$ there exists a positive time T and a function $u\in C([0,T],U)$ such that $u(0)=u_0$,

$$\mathcal{E}(u(t))=\mathcal{E}(u_0),\qquad \mathcal{Q}(u(t))=\mathcal{Q}(u_0)$$

for all $t\in[0,T]$ and

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|u(t)\|_1<R.$$

Theorem 6.7 (Conditional energetic stability) *Choose $s\in[0,1)$. For each $\varepsilon>0$ there exists $\delta>0$ such that*

$$\mathrm{dist}_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}(u(t),D_\mu)<\varepsilon,$$

for all $t\in[0,T]$ whenever

$$u\in M,\qquad \mathrm{dist}_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}(u_0,D_\mu)<\delta.$$

Proof Assume that the result is false. There exist $\varepsilon>0$ and sequences $\{u_{0,n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}\subset M$, $\{T_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}\subset(0,\infty)$, $\{t_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}\subset[0,T_n]$ and $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}\subset C([0,T_n],U)$ such that $u_n(0)=u_{0,n}$,

$$\mathcal{E}(u_n(t))=\mathcal{E}(u_{0,n}),\ \mathcal{Q}(u_n(t))=\mathcal{Q}(u_{0,n}),\qquad t\in[0,T_n]$$

and

$$\mathrm{dist}_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}(u_n(t_n),D_\mu)\geq\varepsilon,\qquad \mathrm{dist}_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}(u_{0,n},D_\mu)<\frac{1}{n}. \tag{50}$$

According to the last inequality there is a sequence $\{\bar{u}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \subset D_\mu$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|u_{0,n} - \bar{u}_n\|_s = 0. \tag{51}$$

The sequence $\{\bar{u}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is clearly a minimising sequence for $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ with $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \|\bar{u}_n\|_1 < R$. It follows from Theorem 1.2(ii) that there is a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\in N_0} \subset \mathbb{R}$ with the property that (a subsequence of) $\{\bar{u}_n(\cdot + x_n)\}$ converges in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ to a function $\bar{u} \in D_\mu$. Equation (51) shows that the same is true of $\{u_{0,n}(\cdot + x_n)\}$, and using Proposition 2.2 we find that

$$\mathcal{E}(u_{0,n}) \to \mathcal{E}(\bar{u}), \qquad \mu_n := \mathcal{Q}(u_{0,n}) \to \mathcal{Q}(\bar{u}) = \mu$$

as $n \to \infty$. Defining $v_n := (\mu/\mu_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} u_n(t_n)$, observe that

$$\mathcal{Q}(v_n) = \frac{\mu}{\mu_n}\mathcal{Q}(u_n(t_n)) = \frac{\mu}{\mu_n}\mathcal{Q}(u_{0,n}) = \mu$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}(v_n) - \overbrace{\mathcal{E}(u_{0,n})}^{\to I_\mu} &= \mathcal{E}(v_n) - \mathcal{E}(u_n(t_n)) \\
&\leq \sup_{u\in U} \|\mathcal{E}'(u)\|_0 \|v_n - u_n(t_n)\|_0 \\
&= \sqrt{2} \sup_{u\in U} \|\mathcal{E}'(u)\|_0 |\mu - \mu_n|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\to 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$, so that $\{v_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is also a minimising sequence for $\mathcal{E}$ over U_μ with $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \|v_n\|_1 < R$. Theorem 1.2 (ii) implies that (a subsequence of) $\{v_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ satisfies $\mathrm{dist}_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}(v_n, D_\mu) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, and since

$$\|v_n - u_n(t_n)\|_s^2 = \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu_n} - 1\right) \|u_n(t_n)\|_s^2 \leq R^2 \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu_n} - 1\right) \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$, we conclude that $\mathrm{dist}_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}(u_n(t_n), D_\mu) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. This fact contradicts (50). □

Appendix

Here we present a short argument demonstrating that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}$ is bounded below over W_1.

Using the Gagliardo-Nirenberg and Young inequalities, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{p+1}(w)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| &\leq c\|w\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R})}^{p+1}\\ &\leq c\|w\|_0^{(1-\theta)(p+1)}\|w\|_{j_\star}^{\theta(p+1)}\\ &\leq c\|w\|_{j_\star}^{\frac{p-1}{2j_\star}}\\ &\leq c_\varepsilon + c\varepsilon\|w\|_{j_\star}^2,\end{aligned}$$

where ε is a small positive number and

$$\theta = \frac{p-1}{2j_\star(p+1)}$$

(note that $(p-1)/2j_\star < 2$ by assumption (A3)). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}(w) &= \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{lw}}(w) + \mathcal{Q}(w) - \mathcal{Q}(w)\\ &\geq c\|w\|_{j_\star}^2 - \left|\int_{\mathbb{R}} N_{p+1}(w)\,\mathrm{d}x\right| - \mathcal{Q}(w)\\ &\geq c\|w\|_{j_\star}^2 - c_\varepsilon\\ &\geq -c_\varepsilon\end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently small values of ε.

Acknowledgement. E. W. was supported by an Alexander von Humboldt Research Fellowship.

References

[1] Abdelouhab L, Bona J L, Felland M and Saut J C 1989 Nonlocal models for nonlinear, dispersive waves *Physica D* **40** 360–392

[2] Albert J P 1999 Concentration compactness and the stability of solitary-wave solutions to nonlocal equations *Contemp. Math.* **221** 1–29

[3] Bourdaud G and Sickel W 2011 Composition operators on function spaces with fractional order of smoothness *RIMS Kokyuroku Bessatsu* **B26** 93–132

[4] Brezis H and Mironescu P 2001 Gagliardo-Nirenberg, composition and products in fractional Sobolev spaces *J. Evol. Equ.* **1** 387–404

[5] Buffoni B 2004 Existence and conditional energetic stability of capillary-gravity solitary water waves by minimisation *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **173** 25–68

[6] Constantin A and Escher J 1998 Wave breaking for nonlinear nonlocal shallow water equations *Acta. Math.* **181** 229–243

[7] Craig W 1985 An existence theory for water waves and the Boussinesq and Korteweg-deVries scaling limits *Commun. Part. Diff. Eqns.* **10** 787–1003

[8] Ehrnström M and Kalisch H 2009 Traveling waves for the Whitham equation *Diff. Int. Eqns.* **22** 1193–1210

[9] Friedman A 1969 *Partial Differential Equations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

[10] Gabov S 1978 On Whitham's equation *Sov. Math. Dokl.* **19** 1225–1229

[11] Groves M D and Wahlén E 2011 On the existence and conditional energetic stability of solitary gravity-capillary surface waves on deep water *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **13** 593–627

[12] Hardy G, Littlewood J E and Pólya G 1988 *Inequalities,* paperback edn. Cambridge: C.U.P

[13] Kato T 1975 Quasi-linear equations of evolution, with applications to partial differential equations In *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **448** — *Spectral Theory and Differental Equations, Dundee 1974*, pages 25–70 Berlin: Springer-Verlag

[14] Lions P L 1984 The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case, part 1 *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **1** 109–145

[15] Naumkin P I and Shishmarev I A 1994 *Nonlinear nonlocal equations in the theory of waves*. Translations of Mathematical Monographs **133** Providence, R.I.: American Mathematical Society

[16] Schneider G and Wayne C E 2000 The long-wave limit for the water wave problem. I. The case of zero surface tension *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **53** 1475–1535

[17] Struwe M 2000 *Variational Methods,* 3rd edn. Berlin: Springer-Verlag

[18] Whitham G B 1967 Variational methods and applications to water waves *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **299** 6–25

[19] Whitham G B 1974 *Linear and Nonlinear Waves*. New York: Wiley-Interscience

[20] Zaitsev A A 1986 Stationary Whitham waves and their dispersion relation *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **286** 1364–1369

[21] Zeng L 2003 Existence and stability of solitary-wave solutions of equations of Benjamin-Bona-Mahony type *J. Diff. Eqns.* **188** 1–32